DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 817 JC 730 154

AUTHOR	Johnson, B. Lamar, Ed.
TITLE	The Junior College Board of Trustees. Occasional Report No. 16.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Junior Coll. Leadership Program.
PUB DATE	Feb 71
NOTE	62p.; Report of a Conference Sponsored by the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, The American Association of Junior Colleges - New Institutions Project, The Regional Education Lab for the Carolinas and Virginia, Duke University, Junior College EPDA Project
AVAILABLE FROM	UCLA Students' Store, Ackerman Union, 308 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, California 90024 ($2.00 each)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; College Administration; Community Colleges; Conference Reports; *Governing Boards; *Junior Colleges; Leadership Responsibility; Post Secondary Education; *Trustees

ABSTRACT

A conference on the junior college board of trustees was sponsored by the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, the AAJC--New Institutions Project, the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, and the Duke University Junior College EPDA Project. The following papers were delivered: (1) "The Role and Responsibilities of Community College Boards of Trustees" by P. Cameron De Vore; (2) "Accountability for Student Learning: A Board Responsibility" by John E. Roueche; (3) "The Junior College Board of Trustees and College Finance" by James W. Hobson; (4) "The Junior College Board of Trustees and the President: A Report of a National Survey" by Don A. Morgan; (5) "The Junior College Board of Trustees and Negotiations with Faculties" by Douglas F. Williams; (6) "The Junior College Board of Trustees and Student Activism" by John Lombardi; (7) "Expanding Perceptions of Junior College Board Members: A Report of a Workshop" by Thomas M. Hatfield; (8) "Junior College Trustees: Organizing for Work Together I" by William H. Meardy; and (9) "Junior College Trustees: Organizing for Work Together II" by Richard E. Wilson. (KM)

ED 078817

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Junior College Board of Trustees

A Report of a Conference Sponsored by

The UCLA Junior College Leadership Program

The American Association of Junior Colleges — New Institutions Project

The Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia

The Duke University Junior College EPDA Project

August 3 - 5, 1970

Edited by

B. Lamar Johnson

Occasional Report No. 16

Junior College Leadership Program
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

February 1971

JC 730 154

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Goodlad (Educ.-UCLA) for Regents

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

© 1971 BY THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CONTENTS

FOREWORD 5
B. LAMAR JOHNSON, Professor of Higher Education
University of California, Los Angeles

The Role and Responsibilities of Community College Boards of Trustees . 7
P. CAMERON DE VORE, Vice Chairman, Board of Trustees, Seattle Community College

Accountability for Student Learning: A Board Responsibility 11
JOHN E. ROUECHE, Director, Junior and Community College Division, Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia

The Junior College Board of Trustees and College Finance 19
JAMES W. HOBSON, Vice Chancellor—Administration, University of California, Los Angeles

The Junior College Board of Trustees and the President: A Report of a National Survey 29
DON A. MORGAN, Associate Professor or Higher Education, University of Minnesota

The Junior College Board of Trustees and Negotiations with Faculties . 39
DOUGLAS F. WILLIAMS, Assistant Professor of Educational Administration, Auburn University

The Junior College Board of Trustees and Student Activism 45
JOHN LOMBARDI, Assistant Superintendent, Emeritus, Los Angeles Junior College District

Expanding Perceptions of Junior College Board Members: A Report of a Workshop 53
THOMAS M. HATFIELD, Assistant Commissioner for Junior Colleges of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System

Junior College Trustees: Organizing for Work Together I 59
WILLIAM H. MEARDY, Secretary, Council of Community College Boards, National School Boards Association

Junior College Trustees: Organizing for Work Together II 63
RICHARD E. WILSON, Director, New Institutions Project, American Association of Junior Colleges

FOREWORD

In a period of change in society and in education it is important to reexamine the role and responsibilities of boards of trustees of educational institutions.

Student unrest and activism are realities in the life of our nation. Faculty negotiations are looming large in the operation and functioning of our schools and colleges. These and other trends and developments inevitably affect the responsibilities of boards of trustees in all segments of American education. And this includes, of course, the junior college.

With the rapid expansion of the junior college—including the establishment of new colleges—unprecedented numbers of new board members are required. Many of these have had little or no experience either as members of boards or with junior colleges.

The National Conference on the Junior College Board of Trustees was planned for both new and continuing board members and for presidents who are associated with them. It was also planned for those who work with boards and presidents—and for students of junior college administration.

Papers and discussions at the conference stressed the role and responsibilities of board members—including accountability for student learning. Also featured was a report of a national survey of the relationships of boards to college presidents—and of presidents to boards. Problems of junior college finance were discussed, as were student activism and negotiations with faculty members.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to recapture the timely and vital discussions which took place at the conference as problems, issues, and proposals were identified, debated, and clarified.

The National Conference on the Junior College Board of Trustees was preceded by an invitational workshop for new members of boards of trustees. In the opening sentences of his report on the workshop, which is included in this publication, Thomas M. Hatfield captures the spirit of much of the discussions at both the workshop and the conference: "If the mood of junior college board members who attended a workshop at UCLA, July 31–August 2, 1970, was a preview of coming events, then administrators, instructors, and students can expect to hear and see more of their trustees. Granted, the twenty-nine trustees who came from across the nation (and one from Canada) may not have been typical of their colleagues, but their emerging chorus was that community colleges need to be 'open door' not only to students but more 'open door' to board members in the informational and, decisional sense."

The National Conference on the Junior College Board of Trustees is the fourteenth summer junior college conference to be held at the University of California, Los Angeles. Attendance numbered more than two hundred from twenty-two states and Canada.

The editor expresses his thanks to those who joined the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program in sponsoring the conference: The American Association of Junior Colleges—New Institutions Project; the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia; and the Duke University EPDA Project. He also thanks William A. Harper, director of public relations of the American Association of Junior Colleges, for editorial services.

B. Lamar Johnson

F. CAMERON DE VORE

THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES

THE CLASSIC ROLE OF COLLEGE TRUSTEES

Picture a board room decorated in dark wood and leather in which a clutch of conservatively dressed establishmentarian trustees gathers monthly to hear a formal report of circumspect, cautious progress from the college president. The discussion is largely financial—academic affairs being "not in our bailiwick," in the words of the chairman. As far as students are concerned, the board, if it thinks of them at all, assumes that the young people are striving to become pretty much what the board members themselves have become. Is this an inaccurate description of a community college board? It does have a whiff of arsenic and old lace about it, but I submit that, until five years ago, it remained essentially accurate for two-year as well as four-year institutions of higher learning.

Many commentators have tried to summarize the most important duties and roles of college boards of trustees. These duties might be succinctly restated as follows:

1. The choice and continuing support of the president: perhaps the most crucial, central concern of any board of trustees.
2. With the assistance of the president, the establishment of the principal purposes and policies of the school.
3. As title holders or trustees of its property, the preservation of the assets of the institution and approval of its budgets.
4. Serving as a court of final appeal in a variety of governance and personnel matters.

From these four prime roles, a variety of subroles are derived. For example, the trustees must always be prepared to represent the institution to the legislature, to the public, and to the college's various constituencies—to explain "the ways of God to man"—or man to God, depending on your point of view. Also, the trustees have a unique role in maintaining academic freedom in the face of threats from within and without the institution.

Is much of this classic analysis simply a pious relic today? If not, how and in what ways is it relevant?

CHALLENGES TO THE CLASSIC ROLE OF THE BOARD

It seems to me that there are three primary challenges to the classic role of the board:

1. The challenge of complexity of the community college

The typical trustee, clutching his bachelor's degree, assumed he knew enough about academia to do his job. Now, however, with the proliferation of programs, projects, and plans—namely, the myriad things that make up the curriculum of a comprehensive community college—the trustee must recognize that he no longer has the luxury of remaining a semi-informed amateur. He must be re-educated concerning the multiple roles of the college. Moreover, and perhaps more basically, he must be resensitized to a deep awareness of the practical problems and human challenges involved in educating people of all ages and from all levels of our society.

The elite educational assumptions of "shaping up or shipping out" which are still the rule in four-year colleges and universities must be recognized as irrelevant at best, inhumane at worst. Coping with this complexity requires an extraordinary amount of time from trustees. This leads to a number of problems, including the difficult question of whether the amateur trustee, trying to work at a full-time job, can properly serve such an institution of higher education.

2. The challenge of a state system

In Washington, we have a state board for community colleges, with strong statutory powers to operate and coordinate the twenty-two community college districts in the state. Last year, the state legislature established a coordinating council for higher education. Without going into specific detail on the role of this "super board," it is safe to say that the trustees of the individual college districts within the system can no longer be described in the classic sense as autocrats of education, possessing more power than they dare use. Now, with vast legislative and public impatience over soaring budgets, and petty bickering and jockeying for position between institutions of higher learning, the era of expanding state coordination is upon us—and it poses squarely the problem of what role the local trustees will have in such a structure.

3. The challenge of the "power-seekers"

As recent crises clearly indicate, higher education and its institutions are tenuous, vulnerable enterprises—resting necessarily on a voluntary coming together to participate in a common enterprise. When this sense of community is lost, chaos comes very quickly indeed. We have had it all in Seattle. *Student power* militants, black, white, and oriental, demanding "all power to the students," "all power to us who are the reason for your existence." Also, we have had *faculty power* militants, demanding that all power go to the faculty, without which, they say, the institution would be nothing. More recently, we have had the *community power* militants, demanding that they and their student allies be given power to operate institutions which, otherwise, could not be what they call "truly community schools."

Now, to these demands, often coming simultaneously from groups seeking additional power, how should we respond? At Seattle Community College, we have acceded to portions of all three demands. We have put a student, a faculty

member, and a civil-service employee on the board in an *ex officio*, nonvoting capacity. We have created citizen groups with substantial advisory powers at each of our three separate campuses. In short, we have modified many old assumptions about college governance.

What, then, is left of the old absolutism of trustee power? Does the demand for trustee "relevance" necessarily mean that each board member to be effective, must stridently advocate the position of a specific constituency during board meetings, instead of attempting, as all good board members have always done, to submerge their special interests to the fullest possible extent?

Another aspect of the present *hyperconsciousness of power* has led to stresses in the classic relationship between the president and his board. The power-seeker groups tend to go where the power is—or where they conceive it to be—to make their demands. They bypass the president. They are vastly impatient or bored with normal administrative channels. They want to communicate directly to and with the board, seeing it as a panacea for their problems. Insofar as the president is a true part of the board—as he should be—the stresses may be minimized. On the other hand, demands for direct access—which are not in practice as easy to deny as they seem to be in theory—tend to reduce the president to the level of just another member of the board in these confrontations.

REDEFINING THE ROLE OF COLLEGE TRUSTEES

How shall we define this new breed of trustees our colleges need for the '70's? Here are five contentious suggestions:

1. More effort must be made to secure the appointment of trustees of intelligence, experience, and dedication

There is no room for political hacks, social butterflies, or "joiners" on boards. Presidents and trustees must swallow their natural reluctance to involve themselves in the political appointment process. I realize this suggestion is fraught with political danger, but if the board is to be truly responsible for its college, it owes the state governor its careful advice as to the selection of new trustees. We might have avoided several days of rioting at Seattle Community College just over a year ago had we been more fastidious on this point. Also we must broaden the pool of potential trustee manpower. All too often, those with free time and ample means are the only ones available to serve—a situation which is full of disconcerting discriminatory overtones. A genuine effort must be made to see that employers in the community become more liberal about released time for employees with the background to serve as trustees. In addition, the real financial loss of serving on a board should, perhaps, be recompensed by the state in cases of need, with something more than the classic pat on the back.

2. Presidents must change

The old presidential maxim of "tell 'em only what you must," or only what will make them feel good, must be replaced by greater efforts to advise the board and keep its members informed. This does *not* mean simply handing out reams of turgid mimeographs with a triumphant air of "so there, you want to be involved, so get out of here and do your homework." The president must

be prepared to lead a board that will increasingly demand greater involvement in many aspects of administration, and will need greater assistance in keeping abreast of the fast-changing configurations of a comprehensive community college.

3. More contact

Greater formal and informal contact is needed between the board and all of the various constituencies of the college—the students, the faculty, community advisory boards, and administration. The board must be more available —not every day, perhaps, but on more than a monthly basis. Incidentally, as an old advocate of student and faculty members serving on boards of trustees, I have changed my mind on that point, and you will be interested to know that many students and faculty leaders have, I think, also changed their minds. For those serving on our board, charges of "copping out" have become a problem. The representatives on the board have generally done a good job—but their very responsibility as *ex officio* board members has watered down their positions as representatives of their groups. *Frankly, I think it may be better for them to continue in their role as advocates and not to dilute their representative nature by serving directly on the board.* However, a corollary of my position is that we devise, with the assistance of the president, a means of allowing meaningful, direct access to the board by student and faculty representatives.

4. It is time for the new breed of trustees to mount some "demands" of their own

For example, don't trustees have a duty to consider the following five points as necessities:

a. *Improved educational accountability that will allow a "success rating" to be applied to the institution.* How many students were graduated? Did they find jobs? Where? How many students completed classes for which they enrolled?
b. *An overhaul of the traditional—and antiquated—educational personnel practices that perpetuate mediocrity.* Examples: tenure and step-lane salary schedules.
c. *Improved clarity and precision in communications,* sounding the death knell for "pedagese."
d. *A vastly expanded program to utilize college resources and facilities,* including libraries, meeting rooms, dining halls, and study areas. The era of monument building may be behind us.
e. *Effective performance-evaluation programs* for all employees, including faculty.

5. None of the challenges to the classic role of the board has altered any of the classic responsibilities of the board

In short, what we are seeing is a proliferation of responsibilities of board members and not simply a redefination of the old roles.

JOHN E. ROUECHE

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR STUDENT LEARNING: A BOARD RESPONSIBILITY

The January 15, 1970, issue of the *Teacher's Letter* carried this headline: "Pressure Point for the '70s—Teacher Accountability." The article beneath carried the following message:

> Look for intensified discussion, sharp emphasis, on this controversial topic. As more money is spent for education, demands for "results" become stronger. That is why you will hear more about the relationship of input-to-output, cost-analysis, cost benefit. It all adds up to accountability of teacher effort.[1]

In the same issue, then Associate Commissioner of Education Leon M. Lessinger was quoted as saying:

> If an air-conditioning contractor promises that his installation will reduce interior temperature 20 degrees below outside temperatures, it takes only an accurate thermometer to determine if the promise has been met. Similarly, if an educational manager promises that all children attending his school will be able to read 200 words per minute with 90 percent comprehension on their 12th birthday, as measured by a specified test, simply giving the test to all children on their 12th birthday will readily reveal whether the promise has been fulfilled.[2]

At this point, it may be well to explain exactly what is meant by the term "accountability." The concept of accountability is relatively simple. It means that community colleges will make it possible for all the community's young people to enroll in college, will provide meaningful and successful learning experiences for all who enter, will regularly assess the effects of the college's efforts, and will continue to revise and make improvements until all who entered the college have excellent chances for success. In short, the community college and its instructors will become accountable (answerable) to community and students for the effects of the educational program. Community colleges will come to guarantee a student that he can succeed in college; this guarantee may eventually even become a "money-back" guarantee!

Dr. Lessinger and others believe that application of accountability to public education is a practical method which we can use to confront some of our most critical educational dilemmas, including reestablishment of public and student confidence in American education.

In February 1970, Don Davies, another USOE associate commissioner, wrote in *College Management:*

> Accountability will soon replace "relevance" as the "in" word among educators.

[1] *Teacher's Letter*, XIX, No. 10 (Jan. 15, 1970), 1.
[2] *Ibid.*

> It means, in effect that schools and colleges will be judged by how they perform and not by what they promise. It means that we are moving in a direction we have been contemplating for a long time—shifting primary learning responsibility from the student to the school. . . . It also means a lot of people are going to be shaken up.[3]

Does the concept of accountability apply to community colleges? Are two-year colleges now accountable? If so, to whom? It will be my purpose here to review the mission (purposes) of two-year colleges, to examine the concept of accountability at the operational level, and, finally, to suggest ways in which a board of trustees can assess a college's performance in achieving its objectives or purposes.

TWO–YEAR COLLEGES: PERSPECTIVES

The community college movement in the United States developed alongside the existing framework for higher education, rather than within it; its philosophy is unique among institutions of higher learning.

The university and the four-year college are characterized by selectivity; their highly structured, traditional programs are available only to those who possess high academic qualifications and can afford the high cost of those programs.

The two-year college, on the other hand, has adopted a philosophy of educational opportunity for all—all abilities, all social and economic classes, all interests, all ages. It has, in effect, claimed to be a utopia with something for everyone. In addition to lower-level studies comparable to those offered at the university, the community college provides diverse curriculum offerings in occupational areas, as well as general interest programs designed to satisfy local demands for social and cultural enrichment. These programs are offered at minimum—if any—expense to the student.

Unlike the selective, elitist, four-year institution, the community college's democratic style, positive social philosophy, and indigenous features hold out the promise of a less hostile and more supportive environment for all of society's alienated students. Its phenomenal growth, in numbers and enrollments, demonstrates its appeal and accessibility to hitherto educationally remote segments of the total population.

Often referred to as "democracy's college," the community college is the product of societal demands for greater educational opportunity for all citizens; therefore, it is more closely identified with "local" societal needs than is any other segment of higher education. Its *raison d'être* is service to society. In fact, the community college stresses that its institutional goals are closely related to the concept that each individual should have the opportunity to progress as far as his interests and abilities will permit. In implementing this concept, most community colleges have established open-door admissions policies—admitting any high school graduate or any person eighteen years of age or older.

The mission of the community college is idealistic. It represents an effort by society to democratize higher educational opportunities. But embarrassment arises when we ask the searching question "How well is the community college doing?"

To be sure, community colleges admit most students who apply. Yet few

[3] "Newsmakers: Accountability," *College Management*, V. No. 2 (Feb. 1970), 7–8.

colleges actually recruit students, and, even more serious, few of the students who venture through the open door persist for more than a few weeks. Well-documented studies reveal that our programs for nontraditional students have been poorly conceived and implemented. Few colleges are doing an adequate job with students from minority groups. In an article, Christopher Jencks offered this commentary on the efforts of the two-year college:

> These colleges are in many respects the embodiment of what advocates of social mobility should want. The public ones usually cost little more to attend than high school, and very few require their students to demonstrate such "middle-class" skills as literacy. They offer a variety of curricula, including some designed for the academically apathetic or inept student. Yet the existence of these colleges has not improved the competitive position of the poor in any dramatic way.[4]

Even those who represent the community college movement are increasingly concerned with the performance of these colleges. Recently, Gleazer identified several issues now facing two-year institutions, including adequate financing and faculty recruitment. Yet Gleazer concluded that the most critical issue confronting the community colleges of this country "is to make good on the implied promise of the open door."[5]

Can the community college make good on its promise to society? I propose that it can, if it will accept the concept of accountability.

THE CONCEPT OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Students have long been accountable, through tests and recitations, for what they have or haven't learned. This new approach turns the tables, and holds the schools and teachers accountable for the students' performance. Speaking on education reform, President Nixon asserted, "We have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of schools."[6]

The concept of accountability has surfaced amid disenchantment among taxpayers, parents, and students with the poor job that education has been doing in ghetto and suburb alike. In a speech, Education Commissioner James Allen observed:

> The people have a right to be assured that the increasingly large investments in education that will be called for will produce results. They can no longer be expected to be satisfied with definitions of school quality that focus primarily on such factors as per-pupil expenditures, pupil-teacher ratios, and teacher salary levels.[7]

The concept of accountability suggests that we stop counting the number of volumes in the library, quit measuring the square footage per full-time student, and immediately start looking at how well students are being taught.

Accountability has gained the most attention so far from "performance contracts," whereby a private company contracts with a school system to run a learning program. The company guarantees that the students will reach certain

---

[4] "Social Stratification and Higher Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXVIII, No. 2 (Spring 1968), 304–305.

[5] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "The Community College Issues of the 1970s," *The Educational Record*, Winter 1970, pp. 47–52.

[6] *The Washington Post*, Monday, March 30, 1970, p. A-2.

[7] *The Washington Post*, March 30, 1970, p. A-2.

objectives in a specified time period. The fee the company receives for its services is based on how well the students are able to perform at the end of the period.

Since August 1970, when the Texarkana, Arkansas, school system awarded a dropout-prevention performance contract to Dorsett Educational Systems—a private, profit-making firm—school boards in Texas, Michigan, California, and Oregon have followed suit.[8] The contractor on one such project is giving the school board a "money-back" guarantee. If the students do not learn (that is, do not achieve the predetermined learning objectives), the school board is not required to reimburse the contractor. Not only are scores of private companies ready to take on such contracts, they can do it and make a handsome profit. This is happening at a time when professional educators are decrying the lack of money available, and teachers are saying, "If the student doesn't learn, it is not my fault. The student is either poorly motivated, possesses a bad attitude, or is dumb." In short, educators plead for more money and better students as the solution to education's ineffectiveness.

The time has come for community colleges and community college teachers to be held accountable for the success of the educational program. Our educational task is to do what other institutions will not or cannot do. We take students other colleges refuse to admit and we offer courses that academicians consider well below "college level." The community college student needs real help in overcoming his learning probems.

Recently, we have begun to question many long-accepted instructional and administrative modes and procedures—for example: the lecture method; the predetermined amount of material to be covered in a given period of time; excessive reliance upon books as a learning resource to the neglect of other media; the organization of learning activities into academic years, semesters, hours, credits, grade-point averages. All of these constitute a restrictive approach to the learning process. The truth about student learning is quite contrary to what educators have long believed. Bloom and other psychologists have advanced the notion that almost all students (perhaps 95 percent of them) can master what teachers want them to learn.[9] By "master," Bloom refers to the grade of A. Imagine any teacher in a community college English class having 95 percent of his students achieve the grade of A. Bloom says that students must be allowed sufficient time and be provided with appropriate instructional assistance in order to realize this level of achievement. If it is to deliver upon the implied promise of the open door, the community college must cast its net of concern much more widely and must formulate, with the full participation of the student, an individual program of educational development based upon individual examination and diagnosis.[10]

ACCOUNTABILITY: THE BOARD'S RESPONSIBILITY

For too long, college trustees have deferred to college administrators on all educational matters. Typically, board members spend almost all of their time on the following activities: attending full board meetings; attending committee

[8] *Education Turnkey News*, I, No. 1 (April 1970).
[9] Benjamin S. Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," *Evaluation Comment*, I, No. 2 (May 1968).
[10] Gleazer, *op. cit.*

meetings; attending *ad hoc* meetings of college groups; making speeches on behalf of the college; soliciting funds; recruiting students; and holding personal conferences with college personnel.[11]

Newburn refers to the relationship between trustees and administrators as one of "amateurs" and "pros."[12] The trustees, of course, are laymen. They assume that the educators they have selected to run the community college (the pros) know best how to organize, administer, and evaluate the college. However, a national study in 1969 revealed that very few community college presidents are assigned any educational responsibilities by the board of trustees. Even more disconcerting, few presidents report regularly to the trustees on educational matters.[13]

There is a vacuum of educational leadership in American community colleges. Board members have seldom seen their role in terms of contributing to the development of good learning and teaching processes—the very essence of the community college. They are concerned primarily with long-range planning, selecting a president, and budgeting for subsequent school years.[14]

Presidents are submerged in the tasks of campus planning, selection of personnel, organization, community and public relations, fund raising, and of staying on top as the mechanic who keeps the educational machine operating. Rarely does the president directly influence the development of an educational climate that provides maximum learning benefits for students and faculty members. Even more rarely does the president question the success of any established program.

Presidents defer to their deans on educational matters. Certainly the title Dean of Instruction implies some responsibility for the educational program in general and instruction in particular. However, an examination of the activities and duties of the dean of instruction would reveal that he spends most of his time filling out forms, writing the college catalog, developing a faculty handbook, scheduling classes, signing student excuses, and placing ads in the local newspaper. The instructional dean in most colleges is concerned with everything *except* instruction.

I recently attended a community college board meeting where the dean reported on his remedial program, which was nearing the end of its third year of operation. The dean reported to the board that "this program is the most sucessful one I know of anywhere." The board commended the dean and president for having designed such an effective program. After adjournment, I asked the dean, "How many students entered this program in its first year of operation?" He responded, "Over three hundred." I then asked how many of those students had stayed in class for one semester, how many persisted for a year, and how many were likely to complete a degree or diploma program. He was dumfounded and embarrassed. He didn't know any of these answers, but he immediately summoned his registrar to find out. At the end of the day, the dean

[11] Morton A. Rauh, *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), pp. 6–7.
[12] H. K. Newburn, "The Board Meets the President," *Junior College Journal*, XXXV (Nov. 1964), 12–14.
[13] Arthur M. Cohen and John E. Roueche, *Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Community College President* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969).
[14] *Ibid.*

was completely dismayed. Most of the three hundred students in the first year had dropped out of school by the end of the first semester. The second-year rate was even worse. Instead of being an outstanding program, it was clearly a flop and in need of desperate modification. The really amazing aspect of this program, however, was that no one in the college or on the board had ever inquired as to what was happening to the students.

Since the board of trustees establishes the college's goals, it must be the board's responsibility to examine the achievements of the college—to learn what progress is being made toward those goals. The continual evaluation of the programs and activities of the college is the responsibility of the trustees, since the trustees are accountable to the community for the educational programs of the college.[15]

Board members must begin to ask the right educational questions of community college presidents. Boards should create an environment which requires presidents to become educational leaders simply to retain their positions. In the study that Cohen and I completed in 1969, we suggested some questions that trustees should regularly pose to the president. For example:

1. What percent of the community's young people attend the college?
2. What percent leave before completing one term? Before completing this program for which they enrolled?
3. What measures are being taken to reduce the attrition rate?
4. Where do students go when they leave school? Types of jobs gained? Further education?[16]

Given our accountability model, other kinds of questions are perhaps even more crucial. For example:

1. What can we expect our students to be able to do after completing a given course at the college? The answer to this question requires that all college teachers develop specific, measurable objectives for the courses they teach. If we define teaching as *causing learning*, we are simply asking the teachers (the pros) to tell us in advance what their students will be able to do after successfully completing their course.

2. What programs are being developed to make instructors more effective in causing students to learn? This is a crucial question, because our teachers, for the most part, have not been prepared to teach. They know a lot of subject matter but very little about how to help students learn it. Trustees must ensure that colleges develop effective in-service training activities for teachers to become more skilled and proficient in producing measurable student learning.

3. Have appropriate learning activities been provided for all students? Many of the students who enter community colleges are illiterate or lacking in communications skills. Yet, by using audiovisual materials, these students can be taught how to communicate effectively while they are simultaneously learning another subject. The conventional lecture method is ill-suited for the vast majority of students who enter the community college. Other kinds of more relevant and successful learning paths must be provided. Yet, as Tendler and Wilson suggest:

---

[15] Mitchell Tendler and Richard E. Wilson, *Community College Trustees: Responsibilities and Opportunities* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970), p. 10.

[16] Cohen and Roueche, *op. cit.*

> ... merely to ask the right questions is hardly enough. Board members should encourage periodic presentations by the students, faculty, and staff. Boards should keep continuing records of questions asked, answers provided, reports requested, and reports received. Only if board members are meticulous in their record keeping can they measure the performance of the college. Each question must be satisfactorily answered, each report must be delivered where requested and contain the necessary information. If such a check is not maintained, the entire procedure is liable to be worthless. Under such circumstances a competent president will welcome the opportunity to keep his board informed, for he is then assured, on a continuing basis, that they understand what the college program is all about and he need not consume his energies with "handling" the board on the basis of charm, personality, or subterfuge. An incompetent president will be pressured rather than assisted by this format.[17]

It is important to remind board members that community colleges are established to facilitate effective teaching. Two-year colleges have long claimed to be "superior" teaching institutions—a claim which has not been substantiated, by the way. The community college is not supported merely to provide employment for teachers; indeed, teachers are needed only to cause learning.

A college president who is a close friend of mine recently dismissed two instructors who, for years, had failed large numbers of students. When enrolling for classes, students avoided these instructors like the plague. The board was divided over the removal of these instructors and several members were concerned with protecting the "rights" of the teachers. I suggest that the proper function of the board is to protect the "rights" of the students.

Community college students are entitled to superior teachers—teachers who are dedicated to helping each of their students learn. Only those teachers who have the ability to produce measurable evidence of student learning should be hired and retained. If the students fail, the teacher and his instruction have been ineffective.

Several of the boards of community colleges in the consortium sponsored by the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia have adopted strong positions with respect to accountability for student learning. John Tyler Community College, for example, has the president report periodically to inform the local board of:

1) the success of students in attaining course objectives, including their attrition and failure rates;

2) the success of students in occupations assumed upon leaving the college, including the employer's perception of the value of the college's programs;

3) the success of students who transfer to other institutions;

4) the extent to which the programs of the college are attaining the stated aims of the college.[18]

Kittrell College, Kittrell, North Carolina, is another two-year college where the board has adopted a policy of total accountability. The teachers at Kittrell are recruited and retained according to their willingness to be evaluated in terms of student success. The boards at Mitchell College and Central Piedmont Community College in North Carolina have also taken strong positions regarding educational accountability.

[17] Tendler and Wilson, pp. 11–12.

[18] Local Board Resolution Concerning Accountability for the Effectiveness of Educational Programs, John Tyler Community College, Chester, Virginia, December 1, 1969 (unpublished).

Community colleges can and must be accountable to the communities that support them. Boards of trustees must assume the evaluation role so desperately needed now. I am convinced that the community college can make good on its promise to educate all persons, provided that it adopts a policy of accountability.

JAMES W. HOBSON

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND COLLEGE FINANCE

As you are most acutely aware, the whole field of educational management is plagued by problems which are common to most institutions. Whenever I attend a meeting of educators I hear the same complaints about the same problems. All institutions need carefully defined and realistic objectives, more buildings and facilities, more and better personnel, and, of course, more money.

FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND THE BOARD MEMBER

Let me set the climate for this discussion by describing the challenge to management in higher education. To be more accurate, I should use the plural, as there are many challenges to management.

First, there is expansion. We congratulate ourselves one moment as a nation 200 million strong, and the next we bemoan the costs of growth. Not only do we have a burgeoning population of young people in the college age brackets, but increasing percentages of young people are extending their education beyond high school. All across the country the great weight of this expansion has been on the public portion of higher education, as private institutions simply have not been able to expand as rapidly. With rising enrollments come rising costs to be paid for somehow, even if the cost of each student's education were to stay the same.

Next, knowledge itself is increasing, which means that there are great pressures to improve the quality of education. At the same time, it is proving very hard to use technology for dramatic improvements in educational efficiency. It is one of the ironies of our present circumstances that education and the advance of knowledge contribute very crucially to productivity gains in almost all economic fields, thus reducing their costs relative to the costs of education. But there seem to be so few ways in which to boost the productivity of the educational enterprise itself.

Any industry whose productivity is improving less rapidly than the average of other industries in the economy will experience rising real costs per unit of output. This is true of education—as it is of most other service industries—and most particularly true of higher education. Until we can find ways to bring greater efficiency to education and make its productivity increase at least as rapidly as the productivity of other sectors of the economy, the unit cost of education must be expected to rise more rapidly than average costs in the economy.

In the last decade, the educational price index has risen roughly twice as

fast as the general price level. At the same time, total full-time enrollment every year has risen nearly three times as fast.

I have outlined some of the challenges we face. The common thread that runs through them is money. Where does it come from? The sources are the student and his family; the institution, with its endowment and other resources; state and local governments, for public institutions; the federal government; and perhaps most relevant for us, because it is something over which we have more control, the generation of resources through more efficient management and through the use of advanced technology.

Since there are no new sources of finances on the horizon, it follows that much attention is focused on the matter of increasing the income received from these sources. The future doesn't look too bright. Increases just to keep pace with the rising economy will be hard to come by, but acquiring additional amounts above this—that future really looks bleak.

Charges to students, especially for instructional fees and tuition, have been increasing. The limit has almost been reached. Increased governmental support naturally means increased taxes or increased deficit spending, both of which encounter substantial public resistance. Philanthropy will continue to depend upon the giving mood of foundations and corporate executives, but the trend seems to be away from support for instruction. There seems to be no solution to the search for means to augment these sources of finacial support.

I'm not trying to describe a hopeless situation. Instead I am attempting to prove that now, more than ever before, the junior college must rely on increased cost effectiveness for every dollar spent, which in itself demands efficient fiscal management. These conditions, I submit, force the board to concern itself more than ever with the fiscal management of the college.

Let me now touch on some of the basic areas in the management of the business of finance of a junior or community college. Business and finance administration can be subdivided into nine defined groups:

1. Fiscal Accounting and Reporting
2. Receipt, Custody, and Disbursement of Funds
3. Budget Preparation and Control
4. Management of Auxiliary Activities
5. Physical Plant Maintenance and Operation
6. Procurement
7. Nonacademic Personnel Administration
8. Investment of Funds
9. Data Processing

FISCAL ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING

Accounting is one area where the questions of centralization versus decentralization aren't raised even in multicampus operations. However, there is a wide variety in types of accounting systems used by junior colleges. Please allow me to observe that 99 percent of the systems in use today are out of date and fail in meeting the needs of management, but tend to meet the restrictions of statutes or by-laws.

What is needed by community colleges, and I might add the movement is

underway in Michigan and Florida, is a uniform cost-accounting system. Such a system would be a modified accrual and cost basis of accounting utilizing budgetary controls. It would become an effective administrative tool by providing cost information for the activity centers of the organization, for which costs are accumulated and criteria established to measure performance.

The board should require adequate reports distributed on a timely and regular basis. The reports should, in addition to reflecting the cash position, summarize current income and expenditures. Many junior and community college boards, fashioning themselves after the local school board, have required board approval on all accounts-payable checks before signature and issue. Their request for a register has included the payee, amount, and items purchased. Orienting the board to the accounting system and providing meaningful financial reports can build the necessary confidence to remove this time-consuming and tedious task from the board meeting.

Most college districts have external audits. The board should insist on such an audit, review it thoroughly and take the necessary steps to implement the procedural changes set out in their recommendations. The business officer should be given the responsibility to assure that routine internal audits are made of all departments authorized to receive cash.

Remember: The purchase of at least a minimum amount of accounting equipment is more economical than labor cost without it. Such equipment will also furnish more adequate controls and will expedite record-keeping.

RECEIPT, CUSTODY, AND DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS

The collection of income is a twofold responsibility involving the collection of monies owed the college and accurate counting and receipting of monies received.

Disbursement of funds involves a regularized legal procedure for payment of all of the college obligations in the right amount on an appropriate time schedule.

In many new institutions a board member signs the checks; in many others the president and one other person are authorized to sign. Regardless of the size of the institution, I recommend that check-signing devices be used, that the signature and control be vested in an employee of the college—not a board member—that the president not be involved, and, above all, that the requirement of a counter-signature on a check be avoided. Proper controls can be easily established on the signature plate. The business manager and one other trusted business staff member can be the alternate. Always keep in mind that misuse of funds is a constant threat; show concern for proper controls and safeguards.

BUDGET PREPARATION AND CONTROL

An institutional budget may be described as a statement of anticipated receipts and proposed expenditures for a given period based upon thoroughly prepared estimates and a careful study of the policies set forth by the governing board. It is a dollars-and-cents explanation of the college program. Its preparation involves the time and talents of many administrators. Although the ultimate authority in budget matters is reserved to the governing board, the responsibility to present the budget recommendation is the president's. Considerations in the budget process are listed below.

1. The business officer supervises the budget operation, since it's a fiscal responsibility.
2. The budget arrangement should follow the same pattern as accounting and reporting, and should meet requirements necessary for easy classification of information by type, function, and object.
3. The preparation of the budget is accomplished by group participation.
4. Budgets should be controlled by departments and divisions, as it is the department and division head's responsibility to live within the approved budget.
5. Since all factors cannot be anticipated in planning, revisions of the budget should be made when conditions warrant.

Budget preparation is really a planning process for allocating resources, but, in most cases, it's a very short-range plan—usually one year—and, traditionally, capital and operating budgets are prepared separately. Often each budget is prepared in different offices at different times, and it is not uncommon to find expenditures budgeted for staff with little or no regard for space to house the new person. More important, there is little opportunity to consider alternates in deploying the institution's total resources.

One excellent system of budgeting is based on a three-fold planning, programming, and budgeting system approach begun in 1961 by the Department of Defense. Modifying this system to fit a college environment can bring to bear full expertise of all campus planners (academic, budget, and capital outlay) on the problem of resource allocation. The *program budget* approach, which is an integral part of this system, differs in many ways from conventional *fiscal* budgeting. It may not be possible, ordinarily, to eliminate the fiscal budget; however, much of the information required for it can be obtained from a program budget form. Some of the more dramatic advantages of the program approach to budgeting are the following:

1. Program budgeting is done in such a way as to exhibit the *objectives* of particular programs and to conduct the budgeting process with those objectives in mind. Both the overall program and the programs of lesser elements are considered and integrated. Budgeting is subordinated to program, not vice versa.

2. *All* the resources and outputs of programs, not merely fiscal resources and outputs, are considered. Time, space, personnel, cost of students, and types and sizes of classes are all exhibited in the budgeting process. "True" costs of programs, not just dollar costs, are thereby made manifest.

3. Budget items relating to particular programs are *put together* instead of being separated into income and expenditure, as in the normal fiscal budget. Thus each program is seen as a whole, with resources and outputs related to each other.

4. *Comparative* study of inputs and outputs of different programs is facilitated; hence, information necessary for decisions to expand or contract in the light of costs and results is compiled. Ordinary budgeting procedures make this comparison difficult, since data are not organized by program but by category of input item.

5. Study of objectives *in relation* to objectives of larger and smaller units is made mandatory. Program elements must be combined into larger programs in

such a way as to achieve the objectives of the larger unit. Opportunity for the elimination or addition, or both, of elements is thus facilitated. A continuous self-study is embodied in the budgeting process itself.

6. Inventory of the *external environment* and the changes which can be anticipated in it are made available. A program's goals, accomplishments, and resources depend upon the support of the environment. Realistic assessment of that environment is essential to sound planning.

7. Once the process is begun, considerable *pressure is removed* from planners. Basic directions for the future, both for long-range and for intermediate goals, are established in principle. Once the basic decisions have been reached, proportionately more attention can be given year by year to revision and realocation.

8. Once outputs and inputs are located by program, the contribution of elements to overall programs can be identified more precisely and allocation of resources can be made more *selectively*. Selectivity rather than budgeting by increment becomes practicable. This is desirable, since choice is always constrained by scarcity of resources, and those resoures must be allocated in the optimal manner if they are to be most effectively used.[1]

To make this system successful, long-range plans for academic development, the building construction program, and a fiscal plan are integrated.

MANAGEMENT OF AUXILIARY ACTIVITIES

Auxiliary activities are self-supporting business enterprises which should contribute to the educational purposes and goals of the institution. Generally, they relate to both business management and student personnel services. In junior colleges, the activities are, as a rule: bookstore, food service, student center. In some colleges, however, these activities include housing, photographic studios, and printing shops. We can also consider a variety of services for these departments, such as duplicating, mailing, addressing, vending machines, blueprinting, sign painting, and data processing. In these situations, the service department is operated independently under the general supervision of the business officer, and charge the departments using their services on a time-and-material basis, so that they become, in effect, self-supporting. Costs will then appear in the budgets of the using departments.

PHYSICAL PLANT MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

Plant-space utilization is a matter of concern. An adequate inventory of all facilities should be kept to assist in space-utilization studies.

Since unattended repair needs spiral with the lapse of time, repair costs increase at an almost geometric rate. Because much of the custodial work is repetitive, substantial improvement can be made by studying the various methods of performance.

Probably the most important part of the physical plant administration is a regular inspection and security program. Preventive maintenance, which is the most economical part of the maintenance program, should include scheduled

[1] Frank B. Dilley, "Program Budgeting in the University Setting," *The Educational Record*, XLVII, No. 4 (Fall 1966), 474–489.

inspection and service to all machinery, roofs, interior walls, windows, doors, fire extinguishers, and traffic lanes.

An up-to-date campus map locating all service lines, shutoff valves, fuses, and alarm stations is a necessity.

PROCUREMENT

Purchasing is an externally very visible function and, because of bidding regulations at most colleges, one which receives undue attention from the governing board. On the other hand, the faculty is generally critical of purchasing procedures because of the standardizations made to effect economies and what they report to be unreasonable time periods to obtain needed equipment and supplies.

The purchasing authority should be centralized so that only one person is responsible for obligating the college, except for standing purchase orders for stated periods, in which authority is delegated to certain persons to purchase from certain companies. Benefits derived from such centralization are: (1) economical use of funds; (2) quality levels maintained; (3) administrative and academic personnel freed; (4) general supplies available when needed.

The board should approve a policy on bid taking which allows the staff to make most decisions on awards, reserving for the board only the awarding of extremely large bids. This procedure will expedite the procurement cycle. The purchasing department should be given the necessary flexibity to award orders to the lowest *qualified* bidder and not just to the lowest bidder.

It is understood that the purchasing department has, in addition to the procurement function, responsibilities for central stores service and property inventory.

NONACADEMIC PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

The business officer is usually responsible for the employment of nonacademic personnel. The administration of this function requires establishment of a sound, comprehensive program which encompasses employees' rights and responsibilities and in which the employee understands his role and its importance.

In my mind, and I may be alone in this thought, the separation of the personnel function into two categories with two sets of standards, two bases of payment, and frequently two unequal fringe benefit programs is unwise for the efficient management of any enterprise. The nonacademic employees, as we term them, play just as vital a role in accomplishing the institution's objectives as do the faculty members. It follows, then, that an institution should have a single personnel office providing services to the individual departments (1) to screen applicants and otherwise aid in recruitment (with the hiring decisions being made by the departments) and to keep records on the employees' attendance, vacation, personal background; (2) to provide statistical information in the form of reports, to provide fringe benefit insurance counselling to employees, to make appropriate job analyses, and establish appropriate range of salary, provide training for employees to upgrade their skills and to understand the problems involved in supervision, to promote an equal employment opportunity atmosphere, and finally, to foster the integration of all employees regardless of race or religion. These functions are basic to a personnel program. All of them can easily be ad-

ministered to all employees without considering the artificial barrier we generally find prevalent in institutions of higher education which divides the human resources into two categories—academic and nonacademic.

In today's complex society, the efficient management of human resources provides immeasurable returns to any college. As a general rule, well-conceived personnel policies, reduced to writing, and practiced religiously, provide the most harmonious environment. The president should give leadership to the personnel department in the creation of these polices, while the board, through its approval, provides the stability for uniform application.

One important thing about any salary schedules developed as a part of this program is the absolute necessity for flexibility. In order to recruit the highest qualified staff, an administrator cannot be tied in by rigid lock-step salary schedules which demand minimum-level entrance requirements. Some guidelines, and the mechanism for obtaining exceptions to these guidelines, will provide the flexibility and control necessary to do the best recruitment while affording equality to all employees.

INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

Interest rates today are high, so it behooves us to make certain all idle monies are properly invested to take advantage of high rates of return. I don't think a junior college board member will need to be too concerned about the problems of investment of endowment funds, but there are great returns available by the proper investment of current funds. For example, many junior college districts are supported by state and local taxes, receiving large portions of their income annually or semiannually. From an accurate cash-flow projection of the institution's money on an in-and-out basis, investment schedules can be made to get the maximum return out of every dollar invested. There is no reason to keep a large amount of money in any commercial account when a low balance would allow many dollars to be invested in very short-term media.

Too often, colleges look at investments in terms of funds idle for three or more months when, in reality, it is possible to invest money for periods as short as three days. I remember a situation when I was in St. Louis, when the postponement of a real estate transaction from Thursday to Monday allowed me to invest the money available for that real estate transaction and earn $1,100 even though it was, in essence, for one and one-half days. Treasury notes, certificates of deposit, open-time savings accounts, and bank repurchase agreements provide many avenues and meet the requirements of college districts requiring limitation of investments of tax funds to U.S. obligations. The final responsibility of all investment actions rests with the governing board, but in the practical situation it is neither possible nor desirable for the board to attempt to deal with all the problems connected with investment management. Competent and independent investment advice can be secured through investment bankers, trust companies, the investment departments of banks, and professional investment counsellors.

One device that is not frequently used is to request bids from financial institutions on monies, requiring that they quote interest for different maturities. When this device is used, banks that have particular cash management prob-

lems will frequently bid higher than normal rates for very short maturities. This device also becomes a public relations tool and avoids the dissent from the community which is fostered when a college deals entirely with one financial institution. Although boards will differ in their degree of involvement in investments, I would say the preference should be given to an arrangement wherein the board establishes broad working policies and requires submission of reports for approval at stated intervals.

Endowment investments and the problems of diversification of portfolios is a subject I will neglect, based on the knowledge that most junior colleges are not faced with the management of many endowment trusts.

DATA PROCESSING

Most board members will candidly admit they know very little about computers and computing. The multiple burdens of the board member are sufficient reason to protest that time has not allowed them to understand the mysteries, real or imaginary, of computing.

In the context of society as a whole, it seems obvious that the development of computer resources is of concern at the very highest levels of educational leadership. The computer may not be sufficient to solve all administrative and academic problems, but in an increasing number of instances it is proving itself necessary.

The basic administrative uses of computers are either transactional or managerial. In almost every case, automated systems are employed for routine transactions—accounts and budgets, payroll, receiving and disbursing, student registration, cumulative records, grade reports, and scheduling. Not as frequently will you find them used for managerial purposes—planning, modeling, simulation, institutional research, and decision-making. Caffrey and Mosmann have noted that:

> In some respects, the financial and business problems of institutions of higher education are more complicated than those of many commercial and industrial organizations. The budgeting and management of funds from a great variety of sources, disbursement to a wide variety of agencies and personnel, and responsibility for the management of resources and for a wide variety of quasi-business enterprises, all combine to put great pressure on the administration for wise and effective planning and control. The advantages of computerized systems, even in small colleges, are more widely accepted and more easily demonstrated in this field of application than in any other.
>
> A comprehensive financial accounting system permits complete integration of all files and procedures across departments, programs, and functions. It provides for daily processing of transactions as well as exception reporting and close control of all revenues and disbursements—and a sound basis for budget planning. A computerized system can provide various methods for analysis and control which are not feasible under a manual system.[2]

The introduction and growth of automated data-processing systems ultimately affects all levels in an organization, but the effects are usually felt at lower levels first and gradually spread upward through the ranks. Redesigning to integrate a system more effectively or increase its usefulness at higher admin-

[2] John Caffrey and Charles J. Mosmann, *Computers on Campus*, American Council on Education, pp. 52–53.

istrative levels may be more difficult and expensive as the system grows in size and complexity.

Perhaps the most important concept for the college board to understand is that the introduction of an automated system which provides more, better, and newer kinds of information more rapidly on shorter notice is bound to affect the entire administrative system.

Growing institutions obviously generate more and more information, not only about increasing numbers of students and staff but also about problems of growth itself (facilities, library books, faculty recruitment, sources of revenue). In a manual system of administration every increase in enrollment of one hundred students may require another clerk. In an automated system such growth can be accommodated simply by running the machine for a few minutes longer.

The automated system, however, although it generates much information, is in the form of coded reports which few of the decision-making managers really find helpful. If they understand the reports, it is found that a variation of the data is needed. This need for changed format of reports points up that the computers as used today are so programmed that changes needed to provide information in different forms are expensive and very time consuming.

Improved technology is now permitting a system design which can provide for management the information that is needed, in the format necessary, and at the proper time, so that good decisions can be made using factual information rather than a system which provides few facts and a lot of judgment for the decision-making process.

Emerging today is a new technique called "Management Information Systems," which board members should be aware of, as it will greatly increase the effectiveness of top managers in coping with the increasing pressures from all sources for factual and timely information to support needs and actions.

DON A. MORGAN

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND THE PRESIDENT: A REPORT OF A NATIONAL SURVEY

An inescapable part of an American community college president's career is that of working with a lay board. Either elected from or appointed from a specific constituency, this lay board is, as has been observed by Gallagher, a unique feature of American higher education.[1] Though as Newburn has observed, the president is a "pro among amateurs,"[2] the board, in most instances, begins its interaction with the president by hiring him. They can also fire him. Only rarely, usually in the private sector, can a college president fire the board. This one-way dependency for survival can complicate a functional relationship between boards and presidents. As with so many human interrelationships, what is perceived as having been done may be more important than what has actually been done. The immediate intent of this paper is to present some perspectives that boards and presidents of two-year colleges have: (1) of each other; (2) of the chief responsibilities of their positions; and (3) of the principle pressures under which they operate in striving to discharge those responsibilities. The objective of the study was to allow the potential of a better understanding of boards by the presidents and of presidents by boards. The outcome hoped for was that they would all then be better prepared to work harmoniously as the "top" of the administration of the colleges served.

THE LITERATURE

Gilliland and Nunnery recently observed that there is not an extensive literature on the subject of community college boards.[3] Cohen and Roueche suggested why this may be so: "It is difficult to assess educational leadership (or, for that matter, any other intangible dimension of the junior college) by perusing the published literature. Journal searches reveal little because junior college *educators* tend not to write."[4]

However, there are publications particularly noteworthy and deserving of

[1] B. C. Gallagher, "Who Runs the Institution?" in *Proceedings of a Conference* (Denver: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Dec. 1966)

[2] H. Newburn, "The Board Meets the President," *Junior College Journal*, XXXV (Nov. 1964).

[3] J. R. Gilliland and M. Y. Nunnery, "Florida Trustees: Characteristics and Opinions," *Junior College Journal*, February 1970, p. 26.

[4] A. M. Cohen and J. Roueche, "Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President" (Washington, D.C.: AAJC, 1969), p. 14.

mention. Giles and Olsen compiled an annotated bibliography on the subject in 1967,[5] and Martorana presented two fine studies in 1962 and 1963.[6,7]

Existing literature suggests three approaches to boards: (1) Keep the board members out of important college affairs because they are hopeless amateurs; (2) Involve the board only on broad policy matters; and (3) Involve the board totally.

The first approach, more prevalent in another era, is reflected by Hughes, who wrote in 1951:

> [Trustees] are called upon to govern an enterprise whose major and most significant tasks they could not possibly themselves perform or in some cases even understand for lack of the intensive specialized training involved.[8]

Hughes had also written, in 1945: "The duties and services of trustees are of three kinds: (1) things not to do; . . ."[9] This period is *not* past, totally. In 1966 Hall offered a list of "ten commandments" for boards which included eight "don'ts" and only two "dos"—the two "dos" were that the board should refer all questions to the president and should insist on written policies.[10]

The second approach is reflected by Rislov who, in 1964, stated that the board's principal responsibilities were: (1) to confirm the objectives of the institution; (2) to adopt policies intended to realize these objectives; (3) to evaluate or appraise the results of the policies.[11] Also in 1964, Newburn stated, as have many since: "Possibly the most important single activity conducted by a board of trustees is the selection of the chief executive officer for the college or university under its direction."[12] Though both these statements still apply, it would be in error to think the board will or should limit itself to these activities now or in the future.

Davis is representative of the third phase. He suggested in 1963 that a "Newer definition of the role of trustees grant them, with faculty and administration, a full part in educational policy and include 'increased interaction between trustees and faculty.'" Davis felt most college administrators now accept this point of view and presented a series of principles of operations for boards.[13]

In real life, as apart from political theory, lay boards can be very frustrating. One of the finest young presidents known will growl frequently, "Boards and trouble are synonymous. I'd just as soon work with a den of rattlesnakes." This young man did not leave his college in a "huff" nor was he fired. He is working

[5] F. T. Giles and O. L. Olson, *Community College Boards of Trustees: An Annotated Bibliography* (Seattle: The Center for Development of Community College Education, University of Washington, May 1967).

[6] S. V. Martorana, "Statewide Coordination of Higher Education: Plans, Surveys and Progress to Date," *Current Issues in Higher Education, 1962* (Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1962).

[7] S. V. Martorana, *College Boards of Trustees* (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963).

[8] R. F. Hughes, *A Manual for Trustees of College and Universities*, 2nd ed. (Ames, Iowa: The Collegiate Press, 1951), p. 173.

[9] R. F. Hughes, *A Manual for Trustees of Colleges and Universities*, 1st ed. (Ames, Iowa: The Collegiate Press, 1945), p. 164.

[10] George L. Hall, "Ten Commandments for Trustees," *Junior College Journal*, XXVI (Apr. 1966), 24–27.

[11] S. Rislov, "The Board's Responsibility," *Junior College Journal*, September 1964, p. 9.

[12] Newburn, p. 12.

[13] Paul H. Davis, "Organize the Trustees," *College and University Journal*, I (Summer 1962), 21–25.

quite well with his "den of snakes." The point, of course, is that he has no other choice, so long as he remains the president of an American community college.

Attempts to employ empirical methods for studying school boards as a part of the administrative structure of education are to be encouraged. Scribner's research model offers a positive direction, and though his study concerned a public school board in but a single district, a principal purpose was to develop a set of concepts for classifying events related to the performance of school boards.[14]

A STUDY OF BOARD PERSPECTIVES

From 1966 to 1969, I asked community college presidents to fill out a series of questionnaires about their jobs and themselves. This continuing study of the presidency was expanded to gain the views of people working closely with the president. It was recognized early that the board of trustees could make a contribution to the study on at least two points—how they viewed themselves and how they viewed the office of the presidency.

Approximately 1,000 questionnaires were mailed in the fall of 1969. There were 131 returned by January 1970, with at least part answered—104 from public and 27 from private community and junior colleges. This seemingly modest return bettered expectations. There were 24 additional contributions through letters and notes.

A second questionnaire was mailed along with the one seeking board views. This second inquiry was directed at the president of the college and sought, among other things, his views of the board. Included were questions about the main purpose, function, and level of performance—this last one asked quite bluntly how the president rated the board's performance. Two hundred and twelve presidents responded to the questionnaire. The findings related to the board are reported below.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Private and public colleges were separated in the tabulated results because substantial differences were found in them. Though public and private board chairmen were *not* in total agreement about the principal functions and duties of boards, they agreed on what the principal pressures for boards are likely to be in the immediate future—finances.[15]

Elected or Appointed Boards

All but two of the private colleges in the study have elected boards. However, thirty-two of the eighty-six public college boards responding were appointed. Of these thirty-two, all southeastern colleges participating in the study, all northeastern, and all from the state of Washington have appointed boards. Elected boards were predominant in the West, excluding Washington, and in the Southwest. Sixteen of the appointed boards were appointed by the governor of the state, and seven were appointed by a joint commission of the school district and the governor. Twenty-five of the appointed boards, therefore, resulted from some involvement of the governor of the state.

[14] Jay Donald Scribner, "A Functional-Systems Analysis of School Board Performance" (dissertation, Stanford University, 1966).

[15] D. A. Morgan, "The Board Speaks Out" (manuscript to be published in future by *Junior College Journal*).

Presidents were asked, "Do you feel boards should be elected or appointed?" No clear decision was reflected in 164 responses: 83 preferred election, 72 preferred appointment, and 9 said it didn't matter. For 36 private college presidents, recommendations were 23 for election and 13 for appointment.

Occupations of Board Members

The chairmen were asked to list the occupations of those sitting on the boards. There were 775 public board members represented. Fifty-three percent were merchants, executives or supervisors (white collar) from commercial occupations, or attorneys. Slightly more than 50 percent of private board members were from the clergy, education, or finance occupations.

The average number of years of service for chairmen of public boards was 2.70, and the average number for chairmen of private boards was 4.64. The average number of years of service for board members of public boards was 6.20, and the average number for board members of private boards was 7.78.

Boards' Satisfactions and Frustrations

Board chairmen reported that their greatest sense of satisfaction in serving on the board came from: (1) participating in the development of a college; (2) providing for the educational needs of students; and (3) satisfaction of performing worthwhile social service. One chairman, from Washington, D.C., observed that the greatest sense of satisfaction came from, "100 percent attendance at committee meetings and board meetings and where the home work had been done." And another, from Illinois, wrote, "Seeing students develop who would not have made it at a four-year university (financially or academically)."

By far the greatest source of frustration reported by chairmen was the matter of financial resources. There were more than three times as many responses in this category than in any other. Other leading frustrations were: (1) fellow members of the board (usually those who missed meetings, but also those who were regarded as too "conservative"); (2) public apathy and lack of understanding of the college's tasks and problems; (3) communication gaps in the college; (4) faculty militancy; and (5) vexing state controls.

Board Functions

Board chairmen reported overwhelmingly that their principal function was to set policy—66.3 percent of public college and 88.9 percent of private college chairmen so reported.

Board Use of Time

Public college boards spent 33.6 percent of their time working on finances and 22.8 percent on college development plans. Private colleges spent 40 percent on committee reports, and 36.8 percent on finances.

Public boards felt that more time should be spent on educational programs, 24.7 percent; on finances, 16.4 percent; and on policy making, 16.4 percent. Private boards, on the other hand, felt that finances, 36.8 percent; planning, 31.5 percent, and policy making, 21.1 percent, deserved more time.

Pressures and Problems

One question attempted to discover what chairmen regarded as the source

of greatest pressure on the board. Public boards noted financing, 50.6 percent; faculty militancy and demands, 14.8 percent; and organized public pressure, 13.8 percent. Private boards had a near total preoccupation with finances, 85.7 percent. This question was followed by one which asked the chairmen what they regarded as the source of greatest future problems or pressures. They were asked to give two choices. (See Table 1).

TABLE 1
SOURCES OF GREATEST PRESSURE ON BOARDS

SOURCE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
A. Public colleges (81 responses)		
1. Securing financing	41	50.6
2. Faculty militancy and salary demands	12	14.8
3. Organized public pressure	11	13.6
4. Enrollment pressures	4	4.9
B. Private colleges (20 responses)		
1. Securing financing	18	85.7

The Board and the President

In separate sections of the questionnaire, chairmen were asked two related questions: (1) How can the president best help the board? (2) How can the board best help the president?

Board chairmen responded to the first question with a nearly unanimous vote that presidents can best help boards by giving information—concisely, thoroughly, and honestly. Seventy-five of ninety-nine public college chairmen, 75.7 percent, and nineteen of twenty-two private college chairmen, 86.3 percent, so responded. Providing "leadership" was a distant second for both public and private colleges.

The answer to the second question was also clear. Board chairmen reported the board can best help the president by supporting him and cooperating with him. Fifty-nine of 110 (53.6 percent) public college chairmen (some gave more than one response) and 13 of 18 (72.3 percent) private college chairmen gave this response.

THE BOARD'S VIEW OF THE PRESIDENCY

The questionnaire sought the views of board chairmen regarding the nature of the community college presidency. Chairmen were asked to describe what presidents were for, what presidents did, what presidents ought to do more of, and the characteristics they would seek in a new president. Table 2 is devoted to the questions about the conduct of the office, and Table 3 concerns the characteristics of new presidents regarded as desirable by board chairmen.

Findings were consistent with the views of others who work closely with the president.[16] However, one area was emphasized by chairmen to a degree not found in the responses of wives, secretaries, line administrators, or faculty.

[16] D. A. Morgan, *Perspectives of the Community College Presidency* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Training Program, University of California, Occasional Report No. 14, March 1970), pp. 108–109.

TABLE 2

THE BOARDS' VIEW OF THE PRESIDENCY

RESPONSE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
What is the principal function of the college president?		
A. Public colleges (104 responses)		
1. As an administrator	75	72.1
2. Public relations man	14	13.4
B. Private colleges (28 responses)		
1. As an administrator	23	82.1
What does a president spend most of his time on?		
A. Public colleges (121 responses)		
1. Overall general administration	54	44.6
2. Public relations work	33	27.2
3. Personnel problems	11	9.1
4. Construction and facilities	8	6.6
5. Student problems	5	4.1
B. Private colleges (35 responses)		
1. Overall general administration	16	45.7
2. Fund raising	8	22.8
3. Public relations work	7	20.0
On what ought a president spend more time?		
A. Public colleges (63 responses)		
1. Educational programs	14	22.2
2. Administration	14	22.2
3. Planning	12	19.0
B. Private colleges (13 responses)		
1. Administration	4	30.8
What are the greatest pressures on the president?		
A. Public colleges (95 responses)		
1. Faculty demands	34	32.0
2. Student unrest and pressures	26	24.5
3. Financial problems	21	20.1
B. Private colleges (26 responses)		
1. Financial problems	13	50.0
What will future problems for presidents most likely be?		
A. Public colleges (122 responses)		
1. Student unrest	44	36.0
2. Financial problems	39	32.0
3. Faculty relations	37	30.3

TABLE 2—*Continued*

B. Private colleges (29 responses)		
1. Student unrest	11	37.9
2. Financial problems	10	34.5
3. Faculty problems	7	24.1

This was the matter of students as a major source of future problems for presidents.[17] Though others expected students to become more troublesome, no one except the chairmen reporting here ranked students as the outstanding future problem. As shown in Table 2, public and private board chairmen alike regarded student unrest, militancy, and pressures from enrollments as the major source of future problems. Students are not now regarded as occupying the president's time.

Generally, chairmen look upon presidents as administrators—that is, they feel that presidents should and do spend most of their time in matters relative to overall direction and general administration of the colleges. Public college chairmen think the president ought to spend more time on educational programming. Even though students were reported as a major source of potential trouble or pressure, there were no recommendations that the president ought to spend more time with them now. Perhaps this indicates that the board expects the president to deal with the problem administratively—hire somebody who can handle the potential problem of students specifically.

Chairmen were asked what characteristics they would look for in a new president if they were going to hire one tomorrow (See Table 3.) Finally, chairmen were asked a series of questions about what a newly elected president should do. (See Table 4.) This represented a follow-through on questions first asked of presidents in 1966.[18]

TABLE 3

DESIRED CHARACTERISTICS FOR NEW PRESIDENTS AS REPORTED BY BOARD CHAIRMEN

CHARACTERISTIC	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
A. Public colleges (149 responses)		
1. A good record of administrative experience	51	34.2
2. Skills in handling or relating to people	34	22.8
3. Dedication or conviction	16	10.7
4. Leadership qualities	13	8.7
5. Appearance, including youthful looks	12	8.1
B. Private colleges (35 responses)		
1. Public relations abilities	10	28.1
2. A good record of administrative experience	8	22.9
3. Leadership qualities	6	17.1

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] D. A. Morgan, "So You've Arrived! Now What Do You Do? *The Two Year College President* (Moses Lake, Wash.: Big Bend Community College, mimeographed).

TABLE 4

RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES FOR NEW PRESIDENTS

RESPONSE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
After a new president is elected, what should he do first (between election and arrival on the job)?		
A. Public colleges (93 responses)		
1. Learn the background on college affairs and history	47	50.5
2. Learn all possible about community	28	30.1
3. Study board policies and organization	7	7.5
B. Private colleges (17 responses)		
1. Learn the background on college affairs and history	13	82.3
What is the first thing a new president should do upon arrival on the campus?		
A. Public colleges (97 responses)		
1. Meet with the total faculty	48	49.4
2. Meet student leaders	15	15.4
3. Meet with the board	11	11.3
4. Make public appearances	6	6.1
5. Establish his "authority"	6	6.1
B. Private colleges (31 responses)		
1. Meet with the total faculty	12	38.7
2. Meet with the student body	11	35.4
3. Establish his "authority"	4	12.9

THE PRESIDENTS' VIEW OF THE BOARD

Many of the questions asked of boards about presidents were then asked of presidents about boards. Though 212 presidents returned questionnaires with some portion filled out, not all answered every question, so that the number of responses to individual items varied. Of 170 public college presidents filling out the item, 123 reported to policy-making boards and 47 reported to boards acting only in advisory capacities to either multicampus districts or state systems. Of 40 private college presidents, 37 reported to policy-making boards.

It is the overwhelming opinion of presidents that boards exist to make policy, with 191 of 203 public presidents so reporting and 25 of 40 private presidents agreeing.

Presidents were asked how they rated their boards for performance. They responded to a scale of excellent, good, average, indifferent and bad. (See Table 5.) Most presidents gave good marks to their boards for performance. A greater percentage of public college presidents rated their board's performance as excellent than did private college presidents—52.7 percent compared with 33.3 percent.

With 151 responses, public college presidents urged that boards improve

TABLE 5
LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE OF BOARDS AS RATED BY PRESIDENTS

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
A. Public colleges (167 responses)		
1. Excellent	88	52.7
2. Good	48	28.7
3. Average	21	12.5
4. Indifferent	4	2.4
5. Bad	6	3.4
B. Private colleges (39 responses)		
1. Excellent	13	33.3
2. Good	20	51.2
3. Average	5	12.8
4. Indifferent	1	2.6
5. Bad	0	0

themselves by becoming more informed or involved (43.0 percent) or through participating in in-service training programs or workshops (37.0 percent). Private college presidents agreed, with 67.7 percent urging boards to become more involved and 19.4 percent recommending in-service or workshop training.

Presidents were asked how boards could best help them as presidents. Their responses are shown in Table 6.

CONCLUSION

Boards take their jobs and their presidents seriously. They view the chief function of the president as that of administering the college along policy lines set by the board members. Boards of community colleges reporting here are not dominated by lawyers, doctors, and farmers, but have the highest representation of members drawn from the business occupations and from

TABLE 6
HOW BOARDS CAN HELP COLLEGE PRESIDENTS,
AS REPORTED BY PRESIDENTS

RESPONSE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
A. Public colleges (230 responses)		
1. Make clearly defined and informed policy decisions	108	46.1
2. Show confidence in the president	61	26.5
3. Help with community relations	20	8.1
4. Give sound advice	18	7.8
B. Private colleges (43 responses)		
1. Show confidence in the president	17	39.5
2. Help in community and public relations	13	30.2
3. By becoming knowledgeable	5	11.6

executive-level positions. In their view of the presidency, boards do not differ substantially from others who work closely with the presidents of community colleges. They do, however, view student problems as being substantially more troublesome in the future than do the others.

A harmonious relationship between the board and the president at any college will create a greater potential for success.

The principal responsibility for boards and presidents is to achieve those goals that society has accepted as proper for the community college. Perhaps success hangs on the thin point of accepting the possibility of rejection. This possibility is not easy for boards or presidents to consider, nor is it ever pleasant when it occurs. But if leadership, as compared with *followship*, is to prevail, there will be times when rejection must be accepted as the price of leading. When asked to nominate leaders in the community college field from among presidents he knew, a fine young president once wrote that there really aren't many "leaders as most (presidents) are simple expedients striving to keep the roof on and boards happy but ignorant." This is too often true if it occurs but once.

In the study reported here, presidents urged that boards get more involved and become better informed. The days when presidents spent excessive time in keeping boards in their place—outside the college—would seem to be ending, and none too soon. Boards, on the other hand, value administrative ability in presidents and urged that the president be supported from positions developed from informed policy making—where the president is obliged to provide clear, honest, and precise information.

DOUGLAS F. WILLIAMS

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND NEGOTIATIONS WITH FACULTIES

Returning to the United States in late 1967 from a two-year tour overseas, I was amazed at the tremendous increase which had taken place during that short time in the use of negotiations for settling faculty-administration problems. Since my experience in education had been primarily as a teacher, it interested me that faculty organizations seemed so well-prepared to engage in negotiations and that the boards and administrators generally did not appear to have the resources to meet such teacher challenges on an equal basis. This imbalance of power (or what seemed to me, at least, to be an imbalance of power) prompted me to conduct research in this area for a dissertation.[1] Hopefully, the study would, first, shed some light on whether or not my suspicions about board and faculty preparation were correct. Second, I hoped that it would suggest guidelines to assist boards and administrators in bargaining more effectively with their staffs.

The State of Michigan seemed a logical choice for a study of this type. Aside from the fact that it is my home state, it is also considered one of the most active in negotiations. Regarded as a trend setter, it is a state recognized in the literature as one with as well-developed negotiating procedures as any in the country.

The sample for this study included fifteen of the twenty junior colleges in Michigan with negotiated written agreements as of fall 1969. Attention was focused on studying whatever documents were available and interviewing those persons who were most familiar with, and preferably had participated in, negotiations in a particular college. I'm appreciative of the cooperation of these participating colleges and the many staff members, especially the chief negotiators, who so willingly shared their expertise and experience with me.

It might be well to begin by isolating two terms for definition. *Collective Bargaining*, as contemplated by the Labor Relation Act, is a

> procedure looking toward making of collective agreements between employer and accredited representatives of employees concerning wages, hours, and other conditions of employment, and requiring that parties deal with each other with open and fair minds and sincerely endeavor to overcome obstacles existing between them to the end that employment relations may be stabilized . . .[2]

[1] Douglas F. Williams, "A Study of the Organizational Procedures for Collective Negotiations in Fifteen Selected Michigan Community Colleges" (doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1970).
[2] Harry C. Black, *Black's Law Dictionary*, 4th ed. (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1957), p. 328.

In the junior colleges I visited the terms *bargaining negotiations, collective negotiations,* and *professional negotiations* were used interchangeably. The term *union* in this study referred to the faculty organization regardless of what it happened to be—AAHE, AAUP, AFT, NEA affiliates, or local independents.

The year 1962 is often looked at as the beginning of the teacher negotiation movement. In that year, Wisconsin passed a law that provided negotiating rights for teachers, the first state to take such action. In 1968, fourteen states had legislation relative to negotiations in education. By 1968–1969, twenty-five states had comprehensive agreements covering teachers. In August 1969, a comprehensive summary by an American Bar Association Committee on State Labor Law reported that some thirty states permitted some or all public employees to negotiate.[8] This report goes on to say that those states without bargaining statutes, with the exception of Nevada, were unanimous in holding that public employees have a constitutional right to join unions.

The Supreme Court has expressed the philosophy that even though the absolute success of bargaining in effecting satisfactory solutions could not be predicted, the chances are good enough to make it worth subjecting issues to the collective bargaining process. These past developments strongly suggest a continued and expanded bargaining activity in all segments of public service.

While public schools (K–12) have led the way in negotiating activity, the movement has spread to colleges and universities and, particularly, to junior colleges. The junior college has been cited by many to be the most successful breeding ground for collective bargaining activity. In addition to the increased enrollments and economic discontent especially relative to the gains made by secondary school teachers, the reasons most frequently put forth are (1) that the faculty has no role in institutional governance, curriculum, or promotion; (2) that there is considerable influence from ex-secondary school teachers on junior college staffs who are often experienced in bargaining and who realize the gains to be made; and (3) that there is sometimes a rigid application of rules in junior colleges. Even though administrations are progressive and willing to share power, and although faculty organizations are successful, the collective bargaining movement in education, demanding recognition, presses forward.

The problem now facing junior college boards and administrators is how to work effectively in the collective bargaining framework. The Michigan experience has shown that the MEA affiliates had the help of part-time professional negotiators and in 1968 had a budget of $275,000 for legal fees alone in connection with negotiations. Few boards seem prepared to meet this organized front on an equal bargaining basis.

One basis for bargaining activity is state law. Many states do not have the comprehensive legislation that Michigan does and, therefore, have not experienced the flurry of bargaining activity in their junior colleges or public schools. Nevertheless, they might well be warned that they are not necessarily immune to it, and that such immunity would not necessarily be an advantage to a state which attempts to provide excellence in its educational system. Boards in states with very little bargaining activity and little comprehensive legislation have

[8] "American Bar Association Committee Report on State Labor Law," *Government Employee Relations Report, No. 310* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, August 18, 1969), B–2.

an excellent opportunity either individually or collectively to exert influence on legislators for equitable legislation. In fact, many Michigan junior colleges feel that the Michigan law heavily favors the teacher organizations, and they are now giving more attention to trying to influence the law than they did in the past.

Regarding legislation, it might be helpful for boards to examine President Kennedy's Executive Order 10988 of 1962, which provided the foundation for the spectacular development in negotiations by public employees. This order, closely resembling the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, did for public employees much of what the NLRA did for the labor movement in private industry and stimulated state and local governments to act accordingly. President Nixon's Executive Order 11491, revoking the previous order of 1962, went into effect on January 1, 1970. It is unique in the attention given in it to the administration of the order through the establishment of a Federal Labor Council, a Federal Service Impasses Panel, and the determination of unfair labor practices for labor organizations as well as for management. A review of these two presidential executive orders along with selected state laws should provide a board with sufficient background to develop positions relative to legislation.

While the law, both state and national, has influenced collective bargaining, it must be recognized that collective bargaining, whether that of unions in the private sector or that of organized faculty groups, has, in turn, contributed to the determination of the law. This delicate interplay between the law's forceful regulation of society and society's power to determine the law makes it both a touchstone and a tool for collective bargaining and a vital consideration for boards and administrators.

Other considerations may have some practical value for individual boards and administrators in their approach to negotiations. No one set of guidelines could apply to everyone. Each college, with its own conditions and needs, must formulate policies according to its particular requirements. The following twelve questions, however, should at least help to identify some of the major problem areas.

1. Is the board willing to allocate resources (time and money) to preparing for the first negotiations? The first contract is especially important, because once it has been set it is difficult to change. A board's early losses can be difficult to regain in later contracts and will usually require some type of concession. Both time and money are required if the pitfalls and mistakes of early bargaining are to be avoided.

2. Is the board willing to become "educated" in the background and processes of collective negotiations? This education, which requires time and expense, might include such activities as participation in workshops and conferences, special use of consultants, and development of pertinent resource materials. Although there was some reaction to "educating" boards in the sample colleges, several chief negotiators had taken steps to do so.

3. Has the board developed a philosophy and attitude which would enable its members to deal effectively with the bargaining process? While successful negotiation requires knowledge of certain essential terms and processes, even more important is the development of attitudes. Good-faith bargaining, for ex-

ample, demands a willingness to bargain with a sincere intent of reaching agreement. It is necessary also that the board and faculty have mutual feelings of trust for their teams and that the two teams trust each other. The board, having set its guidelines and limits, must have enough faith in the chief negotiator not to suspect him if he keeps his counsel and does not always reveal every detail of bargaining strategy. This mutual confidence helps to provide an atmosphere conducive, and necessary, to effective bargaining.

4. Does the board have at least one person on the staff who is experienced and knowledgeable in collective negotiations to serve as the chief negotiator? The negotiating team needs one person to serve as spokesman who can lead the team and take responsibility for its actions. Knowledge of the institution and staff is a definite advantage, but whether the chief negotiator is a staff member or someone from outside the organization, he should be perceptive, skilled in the art of bargaining, and capable of communicating effectively and accurately not only the facts but the interpretation of those facts.

5. Has the board considered carefully the composition of the team, i.e., the number and types of members? Small teams of three or four members have an advantage over larger teams, but regardless of the number, members should be selected for the type of skill and experience which they can bring to the task. An ideal team might include a chief negotiator and one person to represent each of the following areas of the college program: the business office, the department of instruction, and the department of personnel. The services of a *labor* attorney should also be available to the team. Note the absence of board members and chief executive officers. Most authorities recommend omitting them from the team, and the experience of Michigan junior colleges has seen a decided shift away from earlier days when it was common for board members and presidents to be on the negotiating teams. While there are other valid reasons for this change in practice, the prohibitive amount of time required for negotiations severely limits the extent to which either board members or chief executives can participate.

6. Has the board determined its role in negotiations? The role of the chief administrator? The chief negotiator? Other administrative staff? The board should try to define these roles as early as possible. Decisions must be made regarding how much authority is to be given to the chief negotiator and the position of the chief administrator in this structure. Although individual personalities will undoubtedly determine to some extent the role these people assume, some framework should guide the definition of each role. The following suggestions might serve as a broad guide: (a) *The board* sets broad guidelines and a framework within which the negotiating team can work but which allows flexibility for making modifications (within board limits) during bargaining sessions. These might include positions such as what the board will *not* do or give up, what it would do under great pressure, and what it is willing to concede. As indicated earlier, the board probably should not get involved in direct negotiations. (b) *The chief administrator* serves as the chief executive officer of the board and is responsible for negotiations, but delegates the authority to a chief negotiator. He is kept well-informed and helps in whatever way he can to implement board policy, serving as the main channel of communication

between the chief negotiator and the board. (c) *The chief negotiator* is responsible for the actual detail of bargaining activity on the board's behalf, directs the team's efforts and acts as its spokesman, helps to develop board proposals and guidelines, and may also be responsible for the education of other administrative staff, especially with regard to the administration of the contract. (d) *Other administrative staff* are people who basically lend support by helping to gather data; working closely with faculty, they are in a position to assist in anticipating faculty demands and in administering any existing agreements.

7. Are the broad policies of the college—its personnel procedures and faculty handbook—well developed and up to date? Do they accurately reflect current practice? These documents often play an important part in the development of the first contract and are frequently used by courts and mediation boards in their decisions and rulings.

8. Has the college taken steps for adequate data collection? Data collection is a key step in preparing for negotiating sessions, in developing positions and proposals, and for use in supporting positions in the event of later fact-finding or arbitration proceedings. Some chief negotiators develop positions as though each were going to final arbitration.

9. Has the board considered proposals to be presented at bargaining sessions? The board might begin by simply asking, "What do the board and administrative staff want changed?"

10. Has the college developed procedural steps which could be followed, were impasse-resolution procedures to fail and a strike to develop? Emotional and legal aspects of the problem of striking make it an extremely complex area of negotiations, and questions related to it are not easily answered. Some boards have sought legal advice and have planned what they would and would not do in the event of a strike.

11. Has the board taken a hard look at the knotty problem of unit determination? Some considerations are: (a) bargaining groups need to be firmly established before bargaining begins; (b) the board should try to determine the most appropriate unit for their purposes. The following are fairly representative of "appropriate" units: teachers and supervisors, administrators up to the chief administrative officer, clerical staff (except for confidential secretaries who would have access to proposals and strategy before they were presented at the bargaining table), maintenance personnel, and security personnel. (c) Often state boards settle the question of unit determination, and their decision is based, at least in part, on the rationale which has been submitted for the board's as well as the faculty's recommended unit.

12. Has the board developed a proposed set of ground rules for the conduct of the negotiation sessions? Since it is not likely that the faculty's proposed set of ground rules would match those of the board, these ground rules become the first bargainable issues. Items that are often considered: (a) place of meetings, (b) hours and time limits for negotiating sessions, (c) use of alternates, (d) role of resource people—limitations and conditions, (e) release time for faculty negotiators, (f) provision for secretarial service, (g) recording of the proceedings—formal or informal, (h) conduct of meetings—formal or informal, (i) news releases—joint or independent, (j) sequence of negotiable items, (k) tentative

acceptance procedures, and (l) ratification procedures. After the agreement has been signed, careful attention should be given at all levels to the proper administration of the contract. Grievances that may arise can give valuable clues as to the bargainable issues at the next negotiating session.

One chief negotiator participating in the study stressed the idea that preparation for negotiations never stops. All of the participating junior colleges discovered this for themselves eventually. What some of them discovered too late was that their preparation for negotiations should have begun sooner. Much of their learning came through hard and bitter experience, in some cases only after months of emotionally tense sessions between board and faculty conducted on the premise that each side would do the "right" thing by the other. This dependence on the two sides' sense of good will or "morality" seems to characterize, to quite an extent, the thinking of educators about negotiations. The trend in these trend setter colleges, however, was toward greater formalization, sophistication, and specialization of both theory and practice. Labor attorneys, for example, were later preferred over general attorneys. Practice began to be determined more by sound strategy than by dependence on good will or happenstance.

A remark quoted by *Newsweek,* made by the diplomat *par excellence* David K. E. Bruce, recently named to lead the U. S. delegation at the Paris peace talks, is perhaps as applicable to education as it is to foreign policy. "When you get down to negotiations with either hostile or friendly powers, you are out of the moral sphere and in the tactical implementation of policy."[4] How unfortunate that so many junior college boards find themselves at the bargaining table before they have determined what their policy is or whether they even have one! A board's preparation for negotiations can, and should, be begun long before bargaining is imminent. In some cases, such preparation can even prevent "friendly powers" from becoming "hostile" ones.

[4] *Newsweek,* LXXVI, No. 2 (July 13, 1970), 22.

JOHN LOMBARDI

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND STUDENT ACTIVISM

The causes or the origins of student activism are discussed today by educators, psychiatrists, sociologists, legislators, columnists—anyone who has a soapbox or a pen. You can select from among the hundreds of causes almost any point of view you desire. In this essay I shall discuss some of the more commonly mentioned causes of student activism—but I admit I do not know how accurate any of them are. Most of them sound plausible; most of them contain some part of the truth.

First, I shall point out some of the campus conditions associated with student activism. One of the most obvious is the large increase in student enrollments resulting from the population increase, and the larger percentage of high school graduates who go to college now than did a few years ago. Our national policy on draft deferments has made college attendance even more popular with large numbers of young men, a policy many people believe has turned colleges into havens for thousands of draft evaders.

Colleges also contain the most vocal and the most militant opponents of American policies in Vietnam and Cambodia. Students oppose these policies for both humanitarian and selfish reasons. They believe the military actions in Vietnam and Cambodia are immoral and indefensible. Some students may also be influenced by their fear of induction at graduation. Large numbers of faculty members support the students—but that is another topic.

However, student activism is not an isolated phenomenon in this country. Restlessness among students exists almost everywhere—in most South American colleges, in Japan, in the free countries of Europe.

PHASES OF STUDENT ACTIVISM

Student activism may be divided into three phases or crusades. The phase just ended I call the Third Crusade. In many ways, it has been the most crucial and the most unsettling of all, probably because so many Americans are in sympathy with its objective of ending the war in Southeast Asia—even though they are opposed to the violence which sometimes accompanies student dissent. Each of the three phases has its own distinguishing characteristics.

The First Crusade: White Student Activism

The activism of the early 1960s, dominated by the white, New Left, concentrated on issues relating to student conduct and privileges as much as on the Vietnam War, the draft, R.O.T.C., military recruiting, chemical war manu-

facturers, and civil rights. In the junior colleges, students conducted silent vigils, joined in civil rights activities, and demonstrated against the draft and campus military recruiting. But New Left activism was of minor consequence on the junior college campuses when compared to that on the four-year college campuses or with the black student activism of the later 1960s or with the current Third Crusade. In the First Crusade, junior college trustees were involved, but essentially their concern did not lead to changes in the traditional relationship with their chief administrator. Trustees did not interfere in the settlement of campus disturbances. They expected administrators to resolve the campus problems and to recommend changes in policies required by the new conditions.

What did the students accomplish as a result of their demonstrations in the First Crusade? On the main issue, the end of the Vietnam War, they failed. In fact, instead of peace or lessening of participation, escalation took place. America became more deeply committed. But they did call into question the propriety of campus participation in military recruiting, civilian recruiting for war industries, R.O.T.C., CIA activities, and research for military purposes. The students also won the right to have information about alternatives to the draft.

On issues involving their rights and privileges, the students were exceptionally successful. Their agitation accelerated the change in the surrogate relationships of the college to its students. In these gains students were assisted by a series of state and federal court decisions which (1) undermined the doctrine of *in loco parentis;* (2) made education a right, not a privilege; (3) restricted the authority of administrators and board to expel or discipline students arbitrarily—without "due process"; (4) expanded student rights to invite speakers, to express their own views, and to publish their own newspapers without undue censorship; and (5) protected the privacy of student records.

The Second Crusade: Black Student Activism

The Second Crusade had its greatest impact on the junior colleges during the 1968–69 college year. In this phase the leadership shifted from white to black students, with a minor participation by Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Orientals, and American Indians. Black student activism, which dominated the campus scene, had important effects on the relationship of the trustees to the president of the college. The former aloofness of the trustees to the conditions on campus was transformed into active concern by (1) the tactics of the activists, (2) the nature of the demands, (3) the actions of the president, and (4) pressures from the public.

Black student militants often bypassed the president and appealed directly to the board. Sometimes this process was encouraged by a president who was powerless to grant the demands or who wanted to divert the students away from himself. At other times, board regulations restricted the president's freedom of action. Some of the demands involved the trustees individually and as a corporate group. When students demanded a black trustee, the issue became one for the board, not the president. Likewise, a demand for a black president was an issue to which only the board could respond. Other demands involved appropriations for student aid, scholarships, tutors, jobs, lunches, and textbooks. In another category were demands for eliminating discriminatory practices in the apprenticeship programs and in the hiring of blacks on college construction

projects. Black student activism introduced the issue of racism on the campus—an issue that had been prominently featured in the larger society—first in the South and later in the North and West. Black student activism also gave an impetus to other minority students—the Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and American Indians. On the horizon, in some of our cities, another group—the Chinese and the Japanese seem to be stirring—although today, they are still not a serious problem.

Black students were more militant and more successful than other minorities. They were better organized and they got appreciable support from black fellow students, many white students, and black community groups. On campus they were looked upon as the leaders in the struggle of blacks against whites.

Another aspect of minority student activism was the involvement of faculty on the side of administrators. In the white, New Left Activism, many faculty members encouraged students in their struggles. Moreover, the New Left students did not attack faculty, nor did they endanger faculty prerogatives in or out of the classroom. But minority activism affected instructors differently because the minority students (1) attacked them as racists, (2) demanded the right to hire and fire and evaluate them, (3) wanted more minority members among them, and (4) questioned their teaching and grading practices.

It is not surprising that faculty members are as uneasy about minority activism as are administrators and trustees. Often in the last two years, faculty groups appealed to the board to strengthen security measures and to support the administrators in their dealings with minority militants.

The Third Crusade: The Search for a Cause

Students today seem to be the most mercurial constituents of the college community. Whenever someone describes them, they go off in another direction, upsetting the neatly worded speech or article that one has prepared. For a time, during the past academic year, administrators and columnists were telling us that student activism—the violent kind—had subsided, that students' energies were being diverted toward constructive channels. In October and November 1969, Mobilization Days went off with very little violence. The President and the Middle Americans congratulated themselves on the success of the strategy of ignoring the students and their demonstrations. For a brief moment Survival Week and Earth Days in March and April brought students, faculty, administrators, and the public together. This cause concerned all Americans—Middle and Lower and Upper. The campaign against the pollution of our air, countryside, rivers, lakes, and oceans was the closest approach to unity our country has experienced in more than a decade. This campaign closed the generation gap and bridged the chasm between the establishment and its critics. The Women's Liberation Front added an amusing note to the college activist movement, but the group failed to arouse much enthusiasm. Not enough women were willing to become Lysistratas.

But even this uneasy calm could not survive the few weeks that remained in the college year. Cambodia and the Kent State and Jackson State tragedies left no doubt that the war in Southeast Asia troubled students more than any other issue. The intense reaction generated by these events forced many colleges to suspend classes for a four-day pause for reflection and a few colleges to close

for the remainder of the year. What student activists had been unable to do—"shut it down"—governors, college presidents, and board of trustees did. So tense was the situation following the Kent State incident that President Nixon and other public officials shifted from a hard-line policy to a soft-line approach. Whereas the President ostentatiously ignored the M-Day demonstrations in October and November 1969, in May 1970, with almost equal publicity, he appeared among the students attending the anti-Cambodian demonstrations in Washington. In May there was no appeal to Middle America; rather the word went out to tone down official speeches in discussing campus dissent. The President sensed that there was "no longer any significant division among the young people . . . in their view of the war. The culminating effect of the shootings at Kent State was to close campus ranks, not only between radicals and moderates but between students and teachers."[1]

The Third Crusade, which ended with the Spring 1970 semester, did not produce campus changes as dramatic as those of the First and Second Student Crusades. The two campus issues—the Southeast Asian War and Earth Day—affected the colleges only peripherally, not substantively. These issues did not affect student rights as did those in the First Crusade, nor did they affect the curriculum, employment policies, or the instructors' classroom prerogatives as did those issues in the Second Crusade. What the students accomplished was to spotlight national issues, force a change in the administration's policy toward student dissent, and call attention to the probability of civil war on college campuses.

In the First Crusade, students had some support from the faculty; in the Second Crusade, students drove faculties into alliances with administrators. In neither effort did the students get much popular support. In the Third Crusade, students had a great deal of campus and a surprising amount of off-campus support. Earth Day and Cambodia were issues students appropriated from off campus. Students expended much of their energies in letter-writing campaigns to President Nixon and to legislators.

THE TRUSTEES

With this background in mind, I turn to the new role developing for trustees as a result of student activism. I do not wish to imply that student activism is or was the only force acting on trustees—obviously, in any change as significant as that taking place today many forces are operating. Rather, I wish to pinpoint the effects of student activism on trustees. In this section I will indicate the changes taking place in the trustees' role and evaluate the efforts made to deal with student activism from the trustees' point of view.

Colleges and universities have had almost ten years of dissent marked by various degrees of disorder and violence. One of the unhappy prospects is that this unsettled condition may become endemic, a reflection of the unrest in the larger society. Because so much of today's turmoil is taking place on the college campuses the trustees are expected to play a more active part in the search for solutions to the problems dividing our country. This is a natural reaction, since

[1] Norman Cousins, "The Weekend Everyone Went to School," *Saturday Review*, LIII (May 23, 1970), 33.

disturbances and violence on campuses match if not exceed those in the community. How the trustees react during the next few years to this responsibility will influence the future of higher education. As the governing body of the colleges, the trustees are expected to provide the remedies to heal "the national sickness" that Senator Margaret Chase Smith warned us is afflicting our nation.[2]

Unfortunately for trustees, most of the prescriptions for healing the national sickness, based on superficial diagnoses, prescribe bandaids, aspirins, and sedatives, when what is needed is a miracle drug. But trustees cannot wait for a miracle drug, they must try the available remedies.

I offer some suggestions hesitantly. No miracle drug has yet been found for healing our national sickness; in fact, no one knows what caused the sickness of students, anymore than we know the causes of the malaise among priests, nuns, and ministers. Even our military units have not been immune to disaffection. All we can say with assurance is that students, along with the others, are seeking a vague identity and freedom from the effects of crowding in our ever-enlarging urban centers. Strikes by teachers, mailmen, firemen, policemen, nurses, and air controllers are part of the restlessness accompanying the change from an agricultural to an industrial way of life. The suggestions I make for healing the national sickness are more like bandaids, aspirins, and sedatives than like the miracle drug that must eventually be found for the cure.

Foremost among the remedies is the selection of the president, the most important action of a board of trustees. The board must have the utmost confidence and trust in the person selected. It is far better to have an interim president than to select a permanent one whose ability and judgment are in doubt.

From this proposition, it follows that the board must spell out its relationship with the president. In this relationship the trustees must act as a board, not as individuals. No member of the board must presume to act for the board, unless he has been authorized to do so by the majority. A college president is placed in a difficult position if he has two or three conflicting orders on how to handle a crisis such as a student disturbance. At a time of crisis, a college president needs assurance that no board member will be on campus diffusing his authority or telling the news media how a particular crisis should be handled. A president should have the opportunity to consult with the chairman of the board, but it must be on his initiative.

Adopting policies is an important part of this relationship. Policies suggested by the president should be carefully reviewed by the board. If necessary, the board should not hesitate to make changes and, in some instances, to require a reexamination of the proposals when, in its judgment, the policies are unsuitable or poorly prepared.

The time for the board members to evaluate the performance of the president is when the president makes his report to the board. At this time the board has the responsibility and the duty to require a complete explanation from him.

In evaluating a president's performance, the board members have two criteria: (1) the policies which they have established and (2) the manner in which the president followed the spirit and the letter of the policies. The trustees know that no set of policies has yet been developed which covers every emergency.

[2] *Los Angeles Times*, June 2, 1970.

This seems so elementary that I apologize for mentioning it. If there were such a set of policies, there would not be a need for a president. Any clerk, or, better, a pushbutton, would do. For the board, then, the evaluation will be on the president's interpretation and application of the policies in a particular crisis.

If trustees are to perform the duties of selecting the president, adopting policies, and evaluating the president's performance, they will have to spend more than a few hours a week or a month on their assignment. Student unrest has multiplied the number of hours trustees spend in this activity. One board in a meduim-sized school district spent almost full time on problems relating to student disturbances. At one session, the president of the board and several of his colleagues met with militant student leaders from three o'clock one afternoon until four o'clock the next morning. Saturday meetings in some districts are becoming common.

If trustees are to spend more time, they should be paid for their services. It is unfair and unreasonable to expect trustees to continue as the only segment of government giving free service to the community. Besides, the current practice excludes all but the wealthy and retired, removing from the group many people who know a great deal about the causes of dissent.

Along with receiving more time and compensation, boards of trustees should become more representative of the communities they serve. We make much of local control but, in practice, boards of trustees represent a small segment of any district. Trustees come primarily from the white, upper-middle-class, middle-age, professional, Protestant members of the community. Largely unrepresented are the minorities, the non-Protestants, the blue-collar workers. Changes are taking place, but very slowly and only after militant action. Some people are advocating student and faculty representation. In Kentucky, Massachusetts, New York, Hawaii, representation of students and faculty is required either by voting or as *ex officio* members.

Although these remedies will not cure our national sickness, they may prevent the disease from spreading into epidemic proportions. With more time, with less concern about the financial drain on resources with a more representative group on the board, trustees will gain a better perspective on the causes of student unrest and exercise better judgment on the proposals of the president. With a more representative group, they will make more specific demands on the president, will require more significant reports on the state of the college, and will develop more careful policies. For a time it may appear that the role of the president will be considerably reduced. In the long run, however, this will result in a more effective role. The president will be operating more as the chief executive, implementing policies that have been adopted after extended discussion and debate, than as legislator and executive—an untenable position built up over the years through neglect by trustees and overeagerness by presidents to relieve trustees of their duties.

With regard to student activists, several prescriptions are offered as the best thinking that has come up so far. The Indo-China War seems to be the major source of irritation on college campuses. Whether you are a hawk or a dove, you will find student activism more understandable—not necessarily more palatable—if you realize that students are motivated by idealism, humanitarianism, and

selfishness, in varying mixes. Many believe we are engaged in an unjust war, many are willing to suffer the consequences of dissent. In all of this, as I have indicated, they have the support of many Americans. In addition, students have a direct concern because they are the potential soldiers in a war they describe as inhumane and senseless.

Understanding is not a miracle drug, but it may go a long way in relieving some of the symptoms of the national sickness. Understanding may prevent aggravating the sickness through precipitous and repressive action. It may prevent violence. With understanding, trustees can encourage the administrators to provide the means for peaceful dissent. There is some evidence that students who are able to discuss issues that affect them as students and as citizens will engage in constructive action. The "Weekend Everyone Went to School" following the Kent State tragedy and the activities of Earth Day are examples of constructive student dissent.

Trustees can help revitalize student government by encouraging the president to put an end to the sandbox type of activity fostered by administrators who "blow the whistle at any point and change the rules when the will of the faculty, the administration or the taxpayers is in any way challenged." In making rules and regulations, trustees must insist that guidelines be instructive rather than prohibitive. How many times have you walked into a students' lounge or cafeteria and read the depressing signs "No Smoking," "No Food," "No Loud Talking"? Trustees must support the president and not panic at the first appearance of a student group, a community pressure organization, a blast by a political figure. Until they determine otherwise, they must give as much credibility to the views of their administrators as to those of the complainants. They must not undermine the effectiveness of their administrators by accepting without investigation the charges brought before them. They must act as a buffer between the administrators and the public. Neither must trustees expect their administrators to be faultless. As one of President Nixon's advisors observed: "A wise people tempers its pride with humility, reminding itself that to act is to err."[8]

Under the leadership of the president, trustees must adopt policies and regulations dealing with student dissent. Since this is a relatively new field, these policies should be reviewed frequently and modified in conformity with new laws, court decisions, and experience. From time to time the board should require reports on the effectiveness of its policies.

A policy relating to student dissent and to other emergencies should include:

1. A statement on the rights and responsibilities of students formulated coopperatively by administrators, faculty, and students. This is often referred to as a "code of student conduct," required by law in many states. Also required is the distribution of a copy of such a code to each student, faculty member, and employee.
2. An emergency plan for crises. This plan will contain
   a) a hierarchy of leadership;
   b) designation of command posts in various parts of the campus;
   c) supervision and assignment of campus security officers. It is important to carefully define the powers and responsibilities of these campus offi-

[8] Daniel P. Moynihan, "One Step We Must Take," *Saturday Review*, LIII, (May 23, 1970), 21.

cials. There is a danger of creating a palace guard and a gestapo system, a remedy that may be worse than the ailment;

d) guidelines concerning who calls the police and under what circumstances.

3. A campus disciplinary due process system. The judicial machinery and the procedures should be detailed along with the penalty provisions such as warning, reprimand, temporary suspension, expulsion, and probation.
4. A statement concerning amnesty for campus offenses and for civil court convictions.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to reemphasize that no strategy yet devised has been uniformly successful in resolving our campus difficulties. Every major incident of the past year occurred on a campus with an elaborate disciplinary policy and an extensive campus security plan and force. Civil police and national guardsmen have appeared on campuses as frequently as ever.

Trustees have an awesome responsibility to help cure our "national sickness," for its most virulent form is found on our campuses. In applying remedies, trustees have to avoid the danger of contributing to "the fear and frustration that could result in national suicide and the end of everything we Americans hold dear." They must exercise restraint and firmness. Restraint in adopting rules and regulations that deny dissent, and firmness in dealing with extremism, violence, and defiance of law. A failure in either remedy may have disastrous effects on our way of life. A failure in restraint may lead to the loss of

the right to criticize;
the right to hold unpopular beliefs;
the right to protest;
the right to independent thought.

A failure in firmness may result in "repression of dissent because repression is preferable to anarchy and nihilism to most Americans."[4]

Predictions about the end of student activism have appeared each year since the Free Speech Movement of 1964 and nearly all of them have been wrong. In the face of these mocking reminders of fallacious prophecies, you will understand my reluctance to make an unqualified prediction for the 1970–1971 college year. The 1969–1970 college year, which started with guarded optimism, which had periods of tranquility, ended in gloom and despondency. Despite what I have just said about the nature of predictions, I believe that if President Nixon fulfills his promises to end the Cambodian campaign and to withdraw our troops from Vietnam, the college campuses in 1970–1971 may revert to a condition more conducive to learning. What may happen if either promise fails, I refuse to guess. But, regardless of any predictions, the public will put increasing pressure on the trustees to find the remedy for our national sickness.

At the risk of repeating myself, I offer the following near-miracle cure. The best-known prescription for trustees is the selection of a strong chief executive, a person with intelligence, ingenuity, flexibility, and courage. The relationship between the trustees and chief executive must be one of mutual respect. The trustees must have faith in the integrity of the chief executive and he, in turn,

[4] Senator Margaret Chase Smith, *Los Angeles Times*, June 7, 1970, Sec. G, p. 2.

must have respect for the integrity of the trustees. With such a chief executive, the trustees can expect strong, wise leadership. But they must not expect him to be a puppet who moves only when one or more members of the board pulls a string or two. Any man who has the qualities I mention will not submit to this relationship. Trustees who want a puppet can save the taxpayers a great deal of money by hiring a clerk.

Trustees need a strong, trusted chief executive because administration of a college or system of colleges requires more than following rules in a handbook or policy manual. There is no handbook or policy manual that covers the crises that may occur on a college campus. Dealing with black activism was not the same as dealing with the anti-Cambodian crisis. During the former period we had few student codes of conduct. In May 1970, nearly every college had a code of student conduct. How much help were these codes to administrators and trustees? Colleges were closed by action of trustees and by administrators, by those who believed in a hard line of action and by those who believed in a soft approach.

When the next crisis occurs, yesterday's methods will prove about as effective as the Maginot Line. Your best strategy is to rely on your chief executive. If you have any doubts about his ability to meet a crisis, you should replace him with one in whom you have faith.

THOMAS M. HATFIELD

EXPANDING PERCEPTIONS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD MEMBERS: A REPORT OF A WORKSHOP

If the mood of junior college board members who attended a workshop at UCLA, July 31 to August 2, 1970,[1] was a preview of coming events, then administrators, instructors, and students can expect to hear and see more of their trustees. Granted, the twenty-nine trustees who came from across the nation (and one from Canada) may not have been typical of their colleagues, but their emerging chorus was that community colleges need to be "open door" not only to students but more "open door" to board members in the informational and decisional sense. "You can feel it right here in this room," said one board member from Pennsylvania," the restlessness, the sense of impatience, the feeling of accumulated responsibility and frustration at discharging it."

Listening to trustees express themselves in formal sessions and informal gabfests led one observer to reach the following conclusions about the attitudes of the board members who assembled to spend two days and three nights in a university dormitory:

1. They believed in the mission of the community college to provide comprehensive universal post high school education.
2. They wanted objective information on the basis of which to evaluate college programs and the recommendations of the college staff.
3. They felt too dependent on their own executives and wanted to hear more from other colleges and from leaders in the junior college movement.
4. They were eager for the opportunity to associate with other junior college board members.
5. They were acutely aware of increasing public demands for evidence of educational results from tax dollars.
6. They wanted for themselves a more positive role in the governance of their colleges.

Following an opening banquet, John Lombardi keynoted the workshop with an address entitled, "The Board of Trustees: A Key to Public Confidence." The former chief administrator of junior colleges in the city of Los Angeles, Lombardi described a widespread "disillusionment with public education" which he at-

[1] The National Invitational Workshop for New Members of Junior College Boards of Trustees was sponsored by the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, the American Association of Junior Colleges—New Institutions Project, the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, and the Duke University EPDA Project.

tributed to student activism and faculty militance, with a resulting "taxpayers' strike." The determination of student activists and faculty militants to deal directly with college boards has, he said, changed the relationship of presidents to boards. Even as he cited evidence of the trend toward defeat of college bond issues and the rising costs of college operations, Lombardi also argued that today's "unusual public attention to education is proof of its importance to Americans." He interpreted current attacks on education as attempts to correct its deficiencies rather than destroy it. Lombardi called upon the trustees to, in John Gardner's words:

> Keep in touch with all segments of opinion, hear and listen to conflicting views, and avoid the trap of isolation. You have the responsibility not only to solve the educational problems of the district but to help heal the spirit of the college—to eliminate the rifts that are dividing our colleges.[2]

Educational accountability—an increasingly important topic for educators—was a provocative issue which surfaced throughout the workshop. The concept was introduced by John E. Roueche, whose formal remarks were termed, "Accountability for Student Learning: A Board Responsibility." He urged board members to look beyond their usual concerns with college budgets and buildings and to ask penetrating questions about the effectiveness of instructional programs. He suggested that the continual evaluation of the programs and activities of the college is a responsibility of the trustees—since they are accountable to the community for the educational programs of the college.[3]

Bishop George W. Baber, chairman of the board at Kittrell College (North Carolina), and Edwin B. Brooks, Jr., board member from John Tyler Community College (Virginia), told of efforts in their respective institutions to implement educational accountability. Although both men disclaimed that their colleges had developed perfect models of institutional accountability, other board members indicated a keen interest in the results of their efforts, especially because Kittrell College began its thrust for accountability through workshops for instructors and John Tyler Community College began primarily with commitments obtained from a new president selected in 1969.

One of the highlights of the workshop was an afternoon at Orange Coast College some forty miles south of Los Angeles. Hosts for the occasion were Worth Keene, a member of the board of trustees for the Orange Coast Junior College District, and Norman E. Watson, superintendent-chancellor of the district. Keene is the former chairman of the district board and is currently chairman of the Council of Community College Trustees, an affiliate of the National School Boards Association.

Seated around the recreation area of the college's Faculty House, workshop members heard Keene and Watson reflect on the relationship between their board and its executive, a relationship which has developed over many years. The accumulated experience of both men quickly became apparent, and workshop members—most of whom had served on boards for three years or less—began vying for an opening to ask questions or to request elaboration on particular points. Sensitive issues were broached: responding to public outcries at

[2] *Los Angeles Times*, May 17, 1970.

[3] John E. Roueche's paper is printed in its entirety in this report. See page 11.

board meetings; gounds for and procedures for dismissal or transfer of tenured instructors and administrators; reconciling a "split" board; compensating board members; improving board attendance; freedom of student publications.

From the discussion that ensued, one might have concluded that workshop trustees were impressed by the extent to which the board of the Orange Coast Junior College District seems to focus its attention on significant educational questions, the detailed plans which have been made by the college staff to handle delicate matters, and the degree to which the board's executive has maintained a respected professional rather than a dependent personal relationship with his board.

The next day, in a more formal presentation on board-president relations, Abel Sykes, president of Compton College (California), asserted the need for boards and presidents to define their respective roles as a basis for precluding confusion and serious friction. Sykes declared that the concept of the lay board was rooted, in the historical sense, in the principles of respresentative government and all Americans have an obligation to make the concept work effectively.

The role of a trustee from the faculty viewpoint was presented by William A. Nielsen, professor of mathematics at Bakersfield College and president of the California Junior College Association. Nielsen agreed that one of the most important responsibilities of a board was to hire capable administrators but added that this was only the beginning of their responsibilities. "Know your campuses," he admonished. "Be aware and sensitive to the moods of the faculty and students. Insist that the chief administrator devote a portion of each board meeting to explaining the educational programs offered, the counseling setup, student government, community service programs, and so forth." Some board members were startled to hear Nielsen, a faculty member, urge them to "hire a top-flight public relations man."

James Woodward, a student at Contra Costa College and president of the California Community College Student Government Association, told the trustees that it was the "ever-growing desire of students to achieve a position of influence in the institutions to which they have committed so much time and money, institutions which have become essential for achieving the position in society to which they aspire." With regard to instruction in colleges, Woodward declared it was a "well-known fact that in many classes students are taught to live in the nineteenth century" but that students were also "interested in knowledge that can be practiced in everyday life." For that reason, he said, students were "taking it upon themselves to improve their education by evaluation of instructors and classes from the students' point of view." He closed his remarks by urging trustees to abandon what he termed a protective function for the college administration.

The final session of the workshop, a banquet on Sunday evening, was chaired by B. Lamar Johnson, professor of higher education and director of the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program. Mrs. Eleanore Nettle, a workshop staff member and trustee of the College of San Mateo (California) discarded her planned remarks on the "Changing Responsibilities of Board Members" and invited some of her fellow trustees to share some of their views and experiences with members of the workshop. Walter Thompson, twenty-nine-year-old archi-

tect and board member at Ohlone College (California) explained his conscientious desire to serve his community and his college without interfering in college operations. He suggested that board members should be included on teams which visit colleges for purposes of accreditation. Billy A. Hooks, board chairman at Whiteville Community College (North Carolina), described the commitment of his board to maintain a balance of occupational and transfer students as part of an overall regional effort to stem the out-migration of population. Mrs. Elaine Shain, trustee from the Community College of Delaware County (Pennsylvania), related her board's frustrations and final success in establishing a new community college supported by twenty-two public school districts.

In summing up, Mrs. Nettle described the early 1960s as "comfortable" and characterized by public confidence, successful bond elections and general tranquility. The "nervous" late 1960s derived, she suggested, from student unrest, faculty militancy, and a taxpayer strike. And for the 1970s, she predicted:

1. Boards and chief administrators will jointly plan programs and resolve problems.
2. Chief administrators will not be expected to know all the answers or to have perfect judgment.
3. Questions and suggestions from trustees will not be considered meddling in "administration."
4. Boards will set and review institutional goals and objectives.
5. Boards will establish educational program priorities.
6. Boards will evaluate college performance.

During the workshop, participating trustees took occasional "breaks." Some found time for brief swims at noon and in late afternoon and others made the most of their late evenings and early mornings. Certain evidence that the workshop was not all drudgery came in the remark of one board member as he walked away with his flight bag. "Southern California," he said, with chagrin, "is an easy place to mock but a hard place to leave!"

WILLIAM H. MEARDY

JUNIOR COLLEGE TRUSTEES: ORGANIZING FOR WORK TOGETHER I

In its entire history the world has never witnessed such a revolution in education as is now occurring through the rapid expansion of the community college system. As a result, community college education is now big business. In ever-increasing numbers, these colleges are helping to process our most valuable national resource—our young men and women. Within the next five to ten years these same colleges will be preparing more lower division students for their junior year than will all four-year colleges combined. According to Leslie Wiber, chairman of the Department of Higher Education in USC's School of Education, 70 percent of all undergraduates in California are being educated by the community colleges.

The reasons for this expansion are simple. Compared to the four-year college or university, the community colleges can educate our youth less expensively and with greater relevancy, they are more adaptable to changing needs, and they can do as good a job. A community college instructor is hired because he can teach, not because he is research oriented or can or is expected to write books or articles. Also, community college trustees deplore the use of teaching assistants. If the nation's most valuable resource is to be provided with a solid college educational foundation, then quality instruction must be the prime requisite of these institutions.

The dual role of transfer education plus vocational/technical terminal education places the community colleges in the unique position of being the potential servant of all the people—the young, the old, the oppressed, the rich, and the poor. Is it any wonder, then, that a new community college is born every few days in the United States!

Is it only a dream that by 1990, or sooner, the availability of a community college education will be as much a matter of fact as is the availability of a high school education today? All that it takes is a national purpose, a national effort, and a national unity in order to achieve that goal.

Nevertheless, there are problems and obstacles to be overcome. Foremost among these is that of financing the construction and continued operation of these kinds of educational facilities. Financing is not only a local problem; it is a national problem that is reaching critical proportions. Scattered cries for assistance from around the nation are like lost voices in the wilderness. Pleas to state capitals, local governments, and area taxpayers go increasingly unheeded.

Financing problems are causing other social entities to call for a restructuring

of the nation's priorities. Unless we raise a united voice of need, we may find ourselves left out in the cold at appropriations time.

In a country where federal aid to higher education has been governed so long by power politics, it is difficult for a new type of institution to achieve the level of recognition necessary to obtain important legislation when available funds are limited. Perhaps therein lies the crux of the problem—recognition, or the lack of a positive community college image.

What are the answers to these problems? First of all, local efforts at image building and the securing of sound financing must be continued and strengthened. Secondly, affiliating with associations represented here at this conference and within your own state is a necessity. If we are to have a strong voice at any table, if we are to be heard in Washington, or if we are to flex any kind of political muscle, we must organize! Consider the following statement, made by a national association secretary: "In state after state higher education faculties are organizing as they never have, because they have learned that they can accomplish more, better, as a united body than they can as individuals. They are teaming up with state and national education associations for the needed additional strength in numbers, staff, resources and aid."

Should we not organize for the same reasons?

The National School Boards Association (NSBA) is one of the national associations with which board members are encouraged to affiliate. Within the association is a group called the Council of Community College Boards. NSBA is the one national association in the United State organized exclusively to represent the lay leadership in education—board members. The Council of Community College Boards then becomes their national voice, upon affiliation. The Council is headquartered in Evanston, Illinois, a Chicago suburb, with offices also in Washington, D.C., staffed for federal and congressional relations.

By organizing into a national voice, boards of trustees could make known their construction needs for the development of a twenty-year national master plan for federal aid to community colleges. A hit-and-miss federal appropriation, or none at all, is hardly the kind of assistance that a collegiate educational explosion needs for adequate capital expansion of the nation's community college system. By working together, boards of trustees could use the National School Boards Association as the vehicle to achieve the passage of legislation necessary to expedite implementation of a master plan.

Why a master plan? A three-year study of statewide planning for higher education has recently been completed by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. One of its findings is that statewide planning has served to justify the increasing operating and capital budgets of the higher education enterprise on a statewide basis. If community college boards of trustees could (on a national basis) achieve even that one goal, it would vindicate the need for nationwide planning. We might hope that Congress, informed of findings and recommendations of the nation's community college boards, would respond favorably to requests for bipartisan-sponsored federal legislative appropriations for construction and expansion of community colleges.

In order to implement this plan, a legislative committee is presently being organized within our council. Although it has an innocent-sounding name, that committee is expected to pack tremendous political punch. Here is how it will work: We are in the process of matching up names of community college board members with the names of the members of the House and Senate in Washington. We are especially interested in those board members who might be personally acquainted with members of the House and Senate Education Committees.

Separately trustees represent a political muscle totally devoid of any life or organized influence. Collectively, through the Council of Community College Boards, you might take on the form of a meaningful political giant. So, why not unify? Why not organize? The potential of what could be accomplished if the nation's community college boards of trustees organize remains unlimited.

Nationwide organizing and planning will also enhance the community college image. In order to help generate national support, we must exert an effort that will result in more than just a scratch on the surface. It must be an exertion that pervades all community college boards of trustees, inspires them with new ideas and provides them with a climate conducive to bringing about a quiet community college revolution. Nothing less will do. Board members and the nation not only must unite, they must interact.

Through organization, through a national effort, and channeled through a national voice, community college boards of trustees can and will make their mark on the pages of history—today.

Let us join together. Let us organize in order to promote and develop that greatest of all the nation's resources—our youth.

RICHARD E. WILSON

JUNIOR COLLEGE TRUSTEES: ORGANIZING FOR WORK TOGETHER II

It may be that college trustees will become a vanishing breed and that our recent activities and efforts are of no matter. There is considerable evidence that boards of trustees and boards of directors composed of people who can spend only a small part of their time in those positions are uninformed and ineffectual. In the public sector there is a trend toward full-time elected state representatives and city officials. The era of sixty-day state legislative sessions every two years and the city council that meets once a week for two or three hours are disappearing as the number of citizens and accompanying problems grow. In the private sector it is becoming evident that the directors are all too often ignorant of what is happening in the companies they supposedly direct. One of the most recent examples is the Penn Central debacle. In the field of higher education, Rodney Hartnett, who has conducted several surveys of college trustees for Educational Testing Service, observed, "In the long run, in fact, the whole idea of a hierarchical structure in American Colleges and universities, with the board of trustees at the top, may give way to a more egalitarian form of governance."

Although the recent Carnegie Commission report, *The Open-Door Colleges, Policies for Community Colleges*, strongly supports local autonomy and local boards, it seems to be recommending more shared governance with students, faculty, and staff:

> In general, the local policy-making body should be an elected or appointed board of directors, which selects the district superintendent or president. For the most part, the fullest development of community colleges has been in those states in which there has been provision for significant local initiative and financial commitment. Moreover, local boards should delegate substantial responsibility to the administration and the faculty as well as provide an opportunity for students to participate in decisions relating to educational policy and student affairs. In all too many community colleges, even though the board may delegate considerable responsibility to the administration, the faculty and students have very little involvement in policy decisions. This has been damaging to both faculty and student morale.

After adding the accelerating movement toward shared governance with the increasing number and complexity confronting community colleges, the value of part-time trustees is a legitimate and significant question. Unfortunately, the alternatives usually proposed are even less satisfactory. The alternative of centralization at a higher level, usually in state boards and offices, undermines local support and responsiveness. The Carnegie Commission report specifically rec-

commends against strong state systems and advises the approximately dozen states with highly centralized state systems to decentralize. Another alternative is to eliminate boards of lay people and rely on the professional educators. But most people agree that education is too important to be left in the control of educators. In fact, the primary source of dissatisfaction may be the tendency of trustees to yield to educators on matters of significance. It is not uncommon for boards to spend hours on business matters, e.g., item by item examination of check register receipts and purchase orders, and only a few minutes discussing and evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional program, the relevance of the curriculum, and the needs of the community. Furthermore, the discussions of those topics are oftentimes superficial and unimaginative, with no probing and no pointed questions being asked. This is the major weakness of the local board, its tendency to ignore the important issues and questions, relying almost entirely on the judgment of the professionals, and to examine endlessly the trivial details. It is also this tendency, this weakness, that calls for better organizations of trustees at regional, state, and national levels.

There are three major reasons why trustees should organize to work together regularly. Organized programs can help them do a better job of (1) determining college mission statements, objectives, and functions; (2) providing needed resources; and (3) evaluating the operations of the college. In other words, trustees need to organize to more effectively perform their major objectives. Trustee organizations provide opportunities to discuss common problems in meetings and through publications; to learn about new concepts, innovations, and developments at other colleges; to examine issues, weigh alternatives, and reach conclusions as individuals and groups; and to influence other people and organizations, such as fellow trustees, faculty, administrators, the general public, and elected officials, through individual persuasion and organizational clout. These opportunities are available only through organized efforts. Acting in isolation, boards of trustees are suckers for the glib educators, naive babes for the paternalistic politicians, and vacillating, frightened negotiators with the collective bargainers. It is ironic that trustees, the people who have the most "going for them," are least willing to organize and turn events to more nearly achieve their objectives. At times it seems as if some trustees are so convinced right is not only on their side, but self-evident to all, that criticism of them, their actions, and motives, are virtually unthinkable and certainly in bad taste. In most communities those old ideas are definitely myths, and the present realities demand more organized responses.

Community college trustees, like trustees and directors of other organizations, need to reexamine their activities and exert more leadership. They need to become more purposeful and systematic in their behavior and insist that the college operate likewise. Nationally, there is considerable discussion about systems, the systems approach, and planning, programming, budgeting systems. Trustees should apply these concepts in determining college mission statements, objectives, and functions. Trustees need to do a better job of providing resources. Instead of passing along costs to students and postponing needed programs, trustees should exert more pressure on elected representatives and do a better job of selling the college to the public. Finally trustees need

to do a better job of evaluating the activities of colleges. Regardless of how systematically plans are made and how many resources are expended, if the results are not measured and the programs evaluated, community colleges will soon become extravagant and ineffective. Accountability is a concept that needs to be understood and implemented by trustees. All of these things can be ach. ved more quickly and efficiently when trustees join and organize into regional, state, and national associations.

What kind of an organization should trustees form or what association should they join? The answer defends on what trustees are trying to achieve through organized efforts. The answer may be more than one association. So far as I know, there is no conflict between such organizations as American Association of Junior Colleges, Association of Governing Boards, and the National School Boards Association. Trustees as individuals and colleges as institutions should join associations that have goals and conduct activities that will help achieve the college objectives. The second step is for trustees to be certain the college objectives are understood and generally acceptable. The third step is to learn what the goals of existent associations are. The final step is to join associations with like goals and form additional organizations whenever it seems advisable. The first step is to decide that trustees need to organize if they intend to fulfill their responsibilities and achieve the objectives of their colleges.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 27 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

4m-5,'71 (P2473)

Occasional Reports from UCLA Junior College Leadership Program:

1. Frederick C. Kintzer. *Faculty Handbooks in California Public Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 1). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1961. Price, $1.00.
2. Frederick C. Kintzer. *Board Policy Manuals in California Public Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 2). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962. Price, $1.00.
3. *Institutional Research in the Junior College—A Report of a Conference* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 3). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962. Price, $1.50.
4. Frederick C. Kintzer, *President's Report in American Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 4). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1963. Price, $1.50.
5. *Establishing Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 5). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1964. Price, $1.50.
6. B. Lamar Johnson, *Islands of Innovation* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 6). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1964. Price, $1.00.
7. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 7). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1965. Price, $2.00.
8. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Junior College Library* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 8). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1966. Price, $2.00.
9. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *Systems Approaches to Curriculum and Instruction in the Open-Door College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 9). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1967. Price, $2.00.
10. Ervin L. Harlacher. *Effective Junior College Programs of Community Services: Rationale, Guidelines, Practices* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 10). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1967. Price, $2.00.
11. Arthur M. Cohen, in collaboration with Florence B. Brawer. *Focus on Learning: Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 11). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1968. Price, $2.00.
12. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Experimental Junior College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 12). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1968. Price, $2.00.
13. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Junior College President* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 13). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1969. Price, $2.00.
14. Don A. Morgan. *Perspectives of the Community College Presidency* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 14). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1969. Price, $2.00.
15. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Improvement of Junior College Instruction* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 15). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1970. Price, $2.00.
16. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Junior College Board of Trustees* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 16). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1971. Price, $2.00.

For Sale by UCLA Students' Store